One Antidote more,

Against that Provoking SIN of

SWEARING,

By reason of which this Land now mourneth.

Given forth from under the Burden of the OPPRESSED SEED of God, By way of *REPLY* both to *Henry Den's* Epistle about the *Lawfulness*, *Antiquity*, and *Universality of an Oath*, and his Answers to the *Quakers* Objections *against it*, *Recommended* (by him) *to all the Prisons in this* City *and* Nation, *to such as chuse* Restraint, *rather then the violation of their Consciences.*

And also to *Jeremiah Ives* his Printed Plea for Swearing, entituled, *The Great Case of Conscience opened*, &c. about *the lawfulness* or *unlawfulness of Swearing.*

Which said *REPLY* to these two Opposers of the Truth, as it is in Jesus, *is recommended* not onely *to all the Prisons* in this City and Nation, and *to all such* Real *Christians*, as chuse *Restraint* rather *then the violation of their Consciences*; but also *to all such* Nominal *Christians* out of *Prison*, as, rather then *restraint*, chuse to purchase *their Earthly Liberties* by *Swearing*, to the violation of the Command of Christ, who saith, *Mat.*5.33. *Swear not at all: Jam.*5.12. *Above all things my brethren swear not.*

By *Samuel Fisher*, now Prisoner in *Newgate* for his Testimony to the Truth of *Jesus*, this 20*th.* day of the 12*th.* Month, 1660.

For the Land is full of Adulterers. For because of Oaths the Land mourneth, &c. Jer.23.10,11,12,&c.

By Swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood.

Therefore shall the Land Mourn, *and every one that dwelleth therein shall* Languish, Hosea 4.2,3.

London, Printed for *Robert Wilson*, in *Martins* near *Alderſgate.*

564-1892
J. W. Harris



93 m 975

One Antidote more againſt that provoking Sin of Swearing, by reaſon of which this Land now mourneth, &c.

THe Miniſters of Juſtice (*ſo called*) taking occaſion (whether juſtly or no, *God* will judge) by the *KING's late Proclamation*, (occaſioned through that late deſperate attempt in this City of *London*) to flye with great force and violence upon thouſands of People living peaceably and quietly, profeſſing Godlineſs; and more fiercely then on any others, upon thoſe called *Quakers*, whoſe *Practice*, *Principle*, *Profeſſion*, *Purpoſe* and *Promiſe* it hath been, and is, to forgo all fighting with *Carnal Weapons*, ſo as never to lift up an *outward Sword* againſt the *King*, or any other man, ſo much as in the *Defence* of themſelves, much leſs the *Offence* of others, nor to learn War (in that kind) any more; have driven them by droves into priſon, inſomuch as (*England* never ſaw the like) the priſons are ſo full, that there is hardly any room for more.

And though the *Innocency* of the foreſaid People appeareth many ways, as well by the *Confeſſion* of the *dying offenders*, as their own *Proteſtations*, and the *Confeſſion* of the men that would be glad to find occaſion againſt them, but are not able, neither will they in any thing, ſave pertaining to the *Worſhip of God*; yet are they kept in Bonds, as with a Snare, which at this day holds them in, and ſhuts the priſon-doors upon them, in that, though they are taught by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, *Matth.* 5.33. *Jam.* 5.12. *not to ſwear at all*, or *in any wiſe*, no not by *any Oath* whatſoever; yet that *Oath of Allegiance*, required at firſt for no other end but the finding out of *Popiſh Recuſants*, and the tryal of mens faithfulneſs to the

King, after the discovery of that *Papistical* piece of Treachery in the horrid *Powder-Plot* in K. *James* his dayes) is now (besides the first true intent and purpose of it) by some (who more deeply *despited* & *dis-served* the late *King*, *his Father*, then they can ever *serve* the *King* now reigning by their furious drivings) more in malicious hatred against the *Quakers*, his truest friends, then in any right love or friendship to him, most *illegally* and *unduly* imposed on the *Quakers*, who by *Hen. Den* himself, in his *Quaker no Papist*, are prov'd to all men to be no *Papists*; and of whose *active obedience* to him in all things *lawful*, as well as of their *passive obedience*, or patient suffering under the Imposition of things *unlawful*, without violent resistance, both the *King* and his *Council*, as well as most sober-minded men throughout this Nation not only *may be*, but (I verily believe) even *are* also, by this time, informed sufficiently to satisfaction.

I say, the said *Oath* is *unduly* imposed, or rather *unjustly* used, as a *Spiders Web*, as some *Net* or evil *Engine*, wherewith many envious minded men design the *entrapping*, *entangling and ensnaring* such *harmless*, *honest*, *innocent*, and *tender-hearted* people, against whom they bear any private *grudge*, particular *spleen*, or personal *enmity*; so that when they would (in way of revenge) express themselves to the terrifying of such *fools* as they think will be frighted by it, Some that judge themselves to be *Justices*, more by their *Commission* from the *King* to do *Justice*, then by their doing it, threaten them with the *imposition* of the *Oath*; Which silly doings of some men, that know not how *rightly* to rule themselves in their place of Power when they are got into it, made (as I have heard) one, who was not so tender of taking the Oath, as his Adversary thought he was, when he received this *threatning Message* from the *Justice*, viz. *Tell him, I will tender the* Oath *to him*, Very readily return this Answer to his foe, who hoped to fright him by it, *viz. Tell him, that I will take it, if he do.*

Thus *crookedly* and *cruelly* are things carried among the *unjust Justices*, and that Seed of evil-doers which is never to be renowned, in the *dark places of the Earth*, which *are full of the habitations of cruelty*, against the *Righteous Seed*, and the *Children*

dren of the Light, who are more *Conscientious* then to be (as the other are) *Conscious* to themselves of *evil-doing*; yea, and so *partial* in the Law, and in the administration of that they call *Justice*, are some of the *Ministers* of it, that such as they have a spight at, though living far from them, and known in their Enemies own consciences to be both *peaceable* and *unsuspitious* persons, shall be pulled out of their friends *houses*, and pick't up in the very *streets*, to have the *Oath*, on pain of *imprisonment*, and *loss* of all, imposed on them; when others whom they are willing to wink, and very careful to connive at; yea, profess'd *Popish Recusants* (in security of the *King* against whom *onely* the Law for the *Oath* was at first *intentionally* and *directly* made) may sit *securely* under the very *Noses* of some of these *new-found lawless Justices* of neither Peace nor Truth.

Insomuch that though the *Quakers* generally, and some few *Baptists* (while at *liberty*) rather chuse *Imprisonment*, then to take that *Oath*, or any other; and those *thousands* of *Quakers*, and some of those *Baptists* who are in *prison*, and have *Liberty* proffered upon condition of taking the *Oath*, do rather continue there, then purchase their *Liberty* with *Swearing*: Yet very many *Baptists* both *in prison* and *out*, in *Kent*, and elsewhere, being misled by the crooked examples, and *mis-taught* by the crude conceptious of their *untaught Teachers*, that it is lawful to *swear* in some cases, do chuse rather to purchase their *Liberty* by *Swearing*, then either to come into, or continue in prison: Yea, and three or four of those who have sometime gone under the denomination of *Quakers* also, to the great terror, distraction, and wounding of their spirits, so that some of them have cryed out for horror of heart, and have confessed they were in greater bonds then those in prison * [Witness the tenor of a Letter from one of them at *Windsor*, for a Warning to such as yet stand, set down here in the Margent] have rashly subjected themselves for fear, to mans will, against God's in that particular.

* A Copy of a Letter from one that professeth the Truth, but fell from it, and took the Oath.

MY dear Friends, I desire to lay before you this my condition in this my fall: that my fall may be no cause for you to stumble, but that you by it may be the more on

Now

ouraged to ſtand; for I have yeilded to the etrayer, and ſo betrayed the innocent Seed in ne; for I forſook the counſel of the Lord, and onſulted with fleſh and blood, and ſo I fell in- o the ſnare of the world, and yeilded to that Covenant; and ſo I reſted ſatisfied in what I ad done, for ſome certain hours; but when he Lord in his Power looked back upon me, hen I remembred what I had done; then I re- membred that I had denyed Truth, which once I had profeſſed, though once I thought I ſhould have ſtood when others fell. So the terrors of the Lord have taken hold on me, and I lye un- der the judgements of the Lord.

And now I feel the truth of the words that were ſpoke by Chriſt, That he that faileth in one tittle, is guilty of all; and now I feel the truth of that, That it is better to forſake wife, and children, and all a man hath, even life it ſelf, for Chriſt and the Truths ſake, then to break one tittle of the Law of God writ- ten in the heart. So I hope that by mercy and judgement the Lord will redeem me to himſelf again. The Lord may ſuffer ſome to fall, that the ſtanding of them that ſtand faithful, may ſeem to be the more glorious, and for them to take heed leaſt they fall.

Now I know and feel, that it is better to part with any thing of this world, though it be as dear to one as the right hand, or the eye, then to break our peace with God.

Pray for me, for my Bonds are greater than yours.

Windſor the 22. of the 11th. Month. 1660. Edw. Chilton.

Now that I may prevent the im- pendent *evil conſequences* neceſſarily following thoſe men firſt or laſt, who for fear of man ſhall venture to vio- late Chriſts Command againſt *Swear- ing*; to which not only *J. Tombs* in his late *trifling Treatiſe*, (replied to al- ready by my ſelf briefly in the *Epi- ſtle* to my *Book*, ſtil'd, the *Countrey correcting the Clergy*; and more fully by *R. Hubberthorn*) but alſo more late- ly *H. Den* in his *Epiſtle to all Priſons*, and more lately yet *Jer. Ives*, in proof of the *lawfulneſs of Swearing*, have done their beſt to perſwade men.

I ſhall firſt examine the weakneſs of *H. D*'s, and *J. I*'s. proofs for it.

2. Strengthen thoſe of ours againſt Swearing, from thoſe two *Capital* Texts, *Matth.* 5. *Jam.* 5. which, they two with as *little* ſtrength of Reaſon, as to little purpoſe labour to over- turn.

I ſhall begin firſt with *H. Den's Da- little*, (ſince his Sheet came came out firſt) a man that was wont to do bet- ter, and much more, (being a man of more than ordinary ability) when he diſputed againſt the *Prieſtly Dark- neſs* behind him, yet here leſt juſtly

of the Lord to bewray great weakneſs, for his puſhing at a people that are in the Light before him: So let all the *Wiſ- dom* of ſuch, as know not thy hidden ones in that, in which alone thou and thine can be manifeſt, periſh from them (O God) and be converted into *fooliſhneſs*.

Next I ſhall ſhew the *narrowneſs* and *ſhallowneſs* of thoſe two ſheets under which (leſt *H. D*'s ſingle one ſhould not be e- nough) *Jer. Ives* having ſham'd himſelf among the Saints by

Swearing,

Swearing, (seeks more subtilly and shufflingly then successfully) to *shroud* himself out of sight, that the *shame* of his *nakedness* may not appear to all men.

Yet where their *words* and *arguments* are coincident, I shall take notice of them so, as to return answer to them both together.

In proof of the Lawfulness of some Swearing now, *Henry Den* propounds two things: First the *Antiquity*, Secondly, the *Universality* of that practice.

In proof of its *Antiquity* he propounds two *Periods*: The first is about *three hundred years* after the *Moon*, in the daies of *Seth*. The second about *four hundred years* after the *Flood*, in the daies of *Abraham*. From the *first* of which he *conjectures* onely that *probably* it *might be*. From the *second* he *concludes undoubtedly* that it *was* then *in being*.

As to the *first* of these two *Periods*, I have two things to say to it, whereby to discover its *invalidity* to evince the *now lawfulness* of that once (*confessedly*) *lawful*, or at least *allowed* Course, or *Custom* of *Solemn Swearing*.

First, that 'tis but upon a meer *fallible*, *uncertain*, *unwarrantable conjecture* at best (by *H. D's* own confession) on which he derives the *now-warrantableness* of *solemn Swearing* from so high as those daies of *Seth*; witness his own words here under-cited, out of *p.* 3. of his Paper, *viz.*

For the Antiquity *of it, although I cannot say that the practice is as old as the* Moon; *yet I have cause to conjecture, that it is not above* 300 *years younger*: *Indeed what the old world did in this case the* Scriptures *do not speak plainly, and therefore I will pass it by.*

By which we plainly see as concerning the *first Period* pitch'd upon by *H. D.* as his proof of the *Antiquity* of *Swearing*, that, were it an *Antiquity* high enough from whence to argue the *lawfulness* of that *Ceremonious Custom*; yet it is but *doubtfully conjectured*, and but *probably concluded* by him, That it is so *Ancient*, as to be in use at all in the *Old World* before the *Flood*; for he confesseth, That what *the Old World did in this Case, the Scriptures do not speak plainly*: And can *H. D's cloudy conjecture*, that *probably* 'tis not above 300 *years younger than the Moon*, be a *cogent consequence* to 20000 *tender Consciences* in a Case of such Concern-

Concernment as this; wherein they prizing their *peace of Conscience*, with *prison* and *confiscation*, before *Liberty* and *All they have*, with the *violation* of them, do lack no less evidence to their *Conviction* and *Satisfaction*, then *infallible* and *Scientifical Demonstration*?

Secondly, That if it were as certain as 'tis but conceived by *H. D.* that That practice of *Swearing*, by him now pleaded for, was *then* in use; and were it as *undoubtedly*, as 'tis but *doubtfully* derived thence; yet that is not a *Period* so *Antient*, as can serve to prove the *now-lawfulness* of *any sort* of *Swearing* since Christ, who put an end to it, any more then it may serve to prove the *lawfulness* of *now sacrificing* the *fruits* of the ground, and the *firstlings* of the flock in that Ceremonious manner as was *once*, and that long before that of *Swearing*, *apparently* in use, till *Christ* the *substance* of all *Ceremonies* and *Sacrifices* ended it by the *sacrificing* of himself; yea, no more than it may serve to prove the *lawfulness* of *sin it self*, which (though not *de jure*, yet *de facto*) was apparently practised by mankind before either *Sacrificing* or *Swearing*. Which said *Ceremony* * of *Swearing*, as now *used* and *imposed*, with the hand laid on a Book, with kissing, or lifted up, is now ended in *Christ*, the *Witness*, *Covenant*, or *Oath* of God.

That it was used *de facto*, *before Christ* (had it been clearly derived from the time pretended to by *H. D.*) cannot clearly prove, that it *now* is in use *de jure*.

* So called, of καιρὸς and μονὸς, for a season onely. So H.D. himself seems also to call it, p. 3. quoting, Gen. 14. 22. I have lifted up my hand, &c. i. e. I have sworn to the most high God; because the Ceremony of lifting up the hand was used in Swearing.

God under *Moses* and the *Law*, as he suffered other things that were not so *from the beginning*, because of the *hardness* of men's hearts; so because of the hardness of men's hearts to believe each other, while they are besides the *Light* and *Truth*, in the *fall*, in the *lye*, in the *deceit*, in the *darkness* and the *strife*, and so under the *Law*, suffered it so to be as it was in the case of *Swearing*, in order to their *satisfaction* of each other; but *from the beginning*, before sin entered, it *was not so*; nor is it *now so* among the *Saints* and *true Churches*, that are *in God*, nor *shall it be*

so

so in the end, as men by the *Light* come back out of the *strife*, and other deeds of *darkness*, into *Christ* the *Image of God*, after which man was at first made; the *substance* of all *shadows*, the end of the *Law*, that *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *first* and the *last*, the *beginning* and *end* of all things.

And as to *H:D*'s second sort of *new Antiquity*, wherein he sinks well nigh *two thousand years* lower, and falls almost as far *below the Flood*, as he fell *below the Moon* in the former, (which *second period* he mainly insists, and puts the greatest stress upon) though it is not denied, but that Swearing was *then* in use, (and so *H.D.* might have spared his pains in proving it, for I know none deny it to have been used from that time to Christ's) yet it is such a *young* piece of *Antiquity*, as is not worthy to bear that denomination of *Antiquity*, being but a time of meer *novelty* to the former; which former yet, is but meer *novelty* with us.

Much less then is it an *Antiquity old enough* to be urged in proof of the *Lawfulness* of all such actions, as were used in its dayes. For, as when *H.D.* argues *probably* from *Seth*'s time, thus; *Then began men to call on* (i.e.) (according to his meer *Conjectural Construction*) to Swear by the *Name of the Lord*: Therefore *swearing* by the *Lords Name* is *now lawful*: I might *lawfully* by way of *Argument* from *Seth*, yea higher, from *Cain* & *Abel*, urge thus: *Then* began men to *burn Sacrifice* to the Lord; therefore to *burn sacrifice* to the Lord in the old *ceremonious way* is *now lawful*; yea higher yet, from *Adam*, thus; *Then* began men to *Sin* against God; therefore to *Sin* against God is *now lawful*:

So when *H.D.* argues more *positively* from so low as *Abraham*'s time, thus: *Abraham sware* by the Name of the Lord; therefore to *swear* by the Lords Name is *now lawful*: Let him but excuse me in stepping but two or three Rounds lower, *i. e.* two or three generations further, *viz.* to *Joseph* from *Abraham*, who was but his *Great Grandfather*, and (on the same account of but a *little younger Antiquity*, if any *man's practice*, and not *Christ*'s *Precept* onely, were a *Christians Rule*) a man may prove it *now lawful* to *swear* by other matters, which all men judge it *unlawful* now to swear by, as *namely* by the *Life* of *Kings* and *Princes*, on this wise, *viz.* to *swear by the Life of Pharoah*, was in use in *Joseph*'s *days*, and usual also with *Joseph* him-

himself; therefore the *Christians* who are *Brethren* of *Joseph*, whose afflictions men mostly forget, may *now lawfully* swear by the *Life of Charles*; the *lawfulness* of which, *H.D.* himself, I deem, and all his Brethren also, the modern *Baptists*, do utterly deny.

I have done with *H.D.*'s Argument of *Antiquity*, which he makes so much of, as to judge it clearly carryes the case his way, *glorying* in it in this manner, (*viz. Ye see the practice may justly plead* Antiquity) as if he had urged some *great*, *important*, and *impregnable* matter; whenas, as it brings not a *jot* of prejudice to our purpose, who *implead* that practice of *Swearing*; so it adds not a *pins worth* of *profit* or *proof* to *his own*, who is pleading for it; sith as the highest *Antiquity* he pretends to, can (by his own confession, for ought appears from Scripture) at best but *probably*, and therefore not *justly* plead its *patronizing* of, or claim any *acquaintance with* that practise of *Swearing*, so (were it as *infallibly evidenced*, as 'tis but *dubiously conjectured*) that it was *at all before the Flood*, or but *three hundred years younger then the Moon*, yet) even *this*, much more *that*, which was *since* the *Flood*, is but an inferior *Antiquity* in comparison of *that* from which *sacrificing* and *sinning* may *both* be proved to have had a *being*; yea, but an *upstart* piece of *novelty* in the eye of *that Church*, which is now coming out of the *Wilderness*, *fair as the Moon*, *clear as the Sun*, *terrible as an Army with Banners*; even the *Woman* that bears the *Man-Child*, and is *clothed with the Sun* of Righteousness himself, by whom the *Moon* was made; and hath the *Moon* also, even all *moveables*, under feet: Thus *H.D.* hath faultred fowly in *ipso limine*, at the very entrance of his Work, in alledging that in proof of another thing, which he dares speak but *conjecturally* of himself, and its *ill stumbling at the threshold*.

H.D.'s next is the *universality* of this *Ceremonious course* of *swearing*, and that as to *persons*, *places*, *times*: *All sorts* of persons (quoth he) *God*, *Christ*, *Angels*, *Apostles*, *Kings*, *Princes*, *Priests*, *Prophets*, *righteous*, *holy men* in *all places*, *Heaven*, *Earth*, *and all Nations*, by *Practice*, *Precept*, *Prophesie*, at all times *swear warrantably without blame*, *therefore so may we now*. Here's the *sum* and *strength* of *H.D.*'s *second stilt*, on which stands the *decrepid proof* of his *crazy cause*, or *piteous poor plea* for *Swearing*; all which par-

particulars, (with most of *J. I's miserable matters*, which fall in very fitly with them for it) are now to come under *consideration*.

Rep. 1. That *God swore*, we *affirm* & *deny* not; but that *confirms* what we *deny* against *H. D.* and *I. I.* who *affirm* it, that *swearing* is now to be us'd among men, as in dayes of old, God's *Word of the Oath*, *which is since the Law*, under which (as a *Type* of the Truth of *God's Word*, *Covenant* and *Promise* to men in Christ) men used to swear *by God* one to another, which *Word* of his *Oath* also consecrateth not such men *High Priests*, as were of old, who were subject to change, and had infirmity; but him who is *holy*, *harmless*, *undefiled*, *separated from sinners higher then the Heavens*, *a perfect High-Priest for evermore*, *after the Order of* Melchisedec, of Salem *King of Righteousness*, and also *King of Peace*, made (not as they, *after the Law of the Carnal Commandment*, *but*) *after the power of the endless life*; I say, That Word of Gods Oath, is that one *Eternal*, *Substantial Oath*, that ends all strife, of which all *Oaths* us'd for confirmation by men, that are in strife with God and one another, were but the *Figure*, *Ceremony*, or *Shadow* for a time, and before which at Christs coming in, they (though (*de facto*) they do not) yet (*de Jure*) ought to end, cease, decrease, vanish, and flee away, as *sacrifice*, and all other *fleshly Forms* and *Figures*, *Ceremonies* and *Shadows* of *Christ*, the *Truth*, ought, which are not the very *Substance* or *Thing* it self, *Heb.* 10. 1. for the *Law*, or *Letter* in the time before *Christ*, having but the *shadow* of things to come, and not the very *substance* of the things themselves, gives way with all its *sacrifices* and *ceremonies*, to *Christ*; wherefore it's said when he cometh into the World, *Sacrifice and offering thou delightst not in*, *but a Body hast thou prepared me*; in which (as 'tis *written of me in the Volume of thy Book*, (or everlasting Counsels) *Lo*, *I come to do thy will O God*: So God taketh away the *first Will*, *Testament* or *Covenant*, that he may establish the *second*; the *first sacrifices*, that he might establish the *second*, the *sacrifice of himself*; the *ceremonies* and *shadows*, that he might establish the *substance*; the *Type*, that he might establish the *Truth*; the *first kind of Oaths*, or *course* and *custom* of *swearing*, which Oaths men brake by *forswearing* themselves oft, that he might establish that of the second or *New-Testamnet*, even the unchangeable *Oath* of

God, which can never be broken, made by God himself to men, between whom and him, through sin, the *strife* and *enmity* was, that they might have full satisfaction that he is in *Christ*, in whom all *his promises are*, Yea, and in him Amen, *reconciled to the world, not imputing trespasses to them*, but as they shall persist in *irreconcileableness* to him, and that they might have *strong consolation* concerning his love to them: For as *under the Law of old* (as in these dayes also it is (but not lawfully) us'd among men that are *under the Law*, *i.e.* in the *strife*, and other works and lusts of the flesh, and *unbelief* toward each other, which who are in, and led by, and not of the Spirit, are *under the Law*) an *Oath* for *confirmation* was used to end strife; so *Gods Oath* or *Swearing*, which is without repentance, (as mens rash *oaths* and *swearing* now-a-dayes will not be) for he sware, and will not repent of what he hath by Oath confirmed in *Christ*, I say, *God's Oath* for *confirmation* to us, may end the matter among any, but *utter unbelievers*, and give *satisfaction* and *full assurance* to any, but such as being out of that *love*, which *believes all things*, and in the *hatred* and *enmity*, which *believes nothing*, that Christ is the *High-Priest* for ever, by whom his Wrath, who hath had the wrong, is appeased, and is his *well-beloved Son*, *in whom*, with all that will be reconciled to him, *he is* (all their enmity, rebellion and iniquity notwithstanding) *well pleased*: Therefore it's said *Heb.* 6. *We desire you to give all diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end, that ye faint not*, (*i.e.*) in your faith; *but be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promise, for when God made the promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself; for verily men swear by the greater; and an* Oath *to confirm, ends the strife: So God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his Counsel*, as concerning peace with them, though they have acted enmity against him, *added an Oath*, that *by two immutable things*, *i.e.* not his bare Word, or single Promise only (which had been enough, if man by his enmity and hatred of God, had not made himself hard of belief that God should now love him) but his Oath also; *in* either of *which two 'twas impossible for God to lye; we might have strong consolation, who have fled to the hope set before us*, (Christ in us the hope of glory) *which hope we*

have as an Anchor of the ſoul, ſure and ſtedfaſt, which entreth into that within the vail, where the fore-runner is for us entered, even Jeſus, who is made an High-Prieſt for ever after the order of Melchiſedec.

And now foraſmuch as the very ſtreſs of *H.D.*'s Argument from the example of *Gods ſwearing*, lies in this *unanſwerable* Queſtion (as he ſuppoſes it) p.4. *Can that be accounted an evil (if not eaſily undertaken) whereof we have the Lord for a Preſident?*

I anſwer, That may be accounted an *evil* in us to do by way of *imitation* of God, becauſe we read he did ſo (how *uneaſily* ſoever undertaken by us) which yet was onely and purely *good* in God when he did it, unleſs we have him in that, propounding himſelf, as our *Preſident*, and have his *expreſs command* to do the *ſelf-ſame*; God both ſlew his own Son, and as a *Type* or *Figure* of it, in the ſame Chapter wherein he is recorded as *ſwearing by himſelf*, Gen. 22.2. 16.17. bad *Abraham* ſlay his *own Son*; yet though 'twas *good* in God, 'twould be *evil* in us, and the *worſe*, by how much the more *ſeriouſly* undertaken by us, to bid any one ſlay his *onely Son*, upon the account of Gods bidding *Abraham* do ſo, without Gods *expreſs Commiſſion* to us to command another to do the ſame; ſo though *God ſware*, and (as a *figure* of his *Oath*, to end the ſtrife between men and him) allowed men *under the Law* that *Ceremony of Swearing*; yet 'tis *evil* in us either to *ſwear*, or enjoin men to *ſwear* now, without Gods *ſpecial* and *expreſs command* for it, whoſe *expreſs Prohibition* againſt it we have in his *New Will* or *Teſtament*, which we are now under, who are not *under the Law, but under Grace*.

Finally, To *H.D.*'s Queſtion, *What thing God did, which can be evil in us if we do it?*

I reply; Some things are *prohibita quia mala*, forbid to us becauſe *evil* in themſelves, as *lying, deceit, &c.* and ſuch things God never did at all, (muchleſs as a *Preſident* to us) Some things are *mala quia prohibita*, *evil* to us meerly becauſe forbidden, yet were good when commanded; and ſuch if God ſhould do, we may not; and of this ſort is that of *ſolemn ſwearing*, which to us is now as unlawful and evil, as *circumciſing*

eising children in the *flesh*, and requiring the old customs of the *Jewish Law*, and *the Letter*, which now the Gentiles are crept into, to whom is given the *outer Court* of *carnal Commandments*, *shadows*, *signs*, *figures*, *types* and *ceremonies*, *fleshly*, *empty formalities*, *beggarly rudiments*, *bodily exercises*, *divers baptisms*, *eatings*, *drinkings*, and other *outside observations*, and *ordinances of divine services* performed in *worldly sanctuaries*, in which the *old Covenant* stood, impos'd only till the time of *reformation*, *restoration*, *regeneration*, and *restitution of all* things to the beginning by *Christ*, the Substance & End of all those, *Acts* 21.22. *Heb.*9.1.9.10. *Psal.*23.2. *Matth.* 19.28. *Acts* 3.21. Such God once permitted, yea commanded, as *dark*, *obscure*, *external*, and *temporal* representations of future more *clear*, *spiritual*, *substantial*, *soul-saving*, *powerful*, *internal*, and *eternal truths*; but now forbids; the *one sacrifice* of his Son, the *one circumcision* of the heart, the *one* Baptism and Supper; his own *one* immutable Oath to us, and our *yea* and *nay* in *Christ*, standing among the *holy Seed*, which is the *substance* of the Oak, whose fair leaves are *now* falling off, and instead of all these, and as the Substance of them all, and that for ever. *Isa.*6.13.

2. And as for the *Angels swearing*, which is alledged by *H.D.* as an *ensample* to us; for (quoth he) *An Angel swears*, *Rev.*10.5.6. What's that to us? If an *Angel from Heaven should preach any other Doctrine then what is preached by*, *and received from Christ and the Apostles*, *let him be accursed*; I *say it again*, *let him be accursed*: Yet I say not that the *Angels*, who are *Ministers of the Law*, (for *the Law was given by the dispensation of* Angels *in the hand of the old Mediator* Moses) though they sware, are accursed; for that *Ceremony* of *Swearing* belonged to the Law, that was given by them; but I say, this is no *President* for them who are under the Doctrine of the *Son* himself, who are not to go back, so as to rebel against the *Commands* of the *Son*, to follow the bare *example* of the *servant Moses*, in whose hand the *Law* was given by the dispensation of *Angels*: *Moses* was faithful in all his house (the old *Israel*) as a *servant*, for a *Typical* Testimony of those true things that were to be spoken after *Heb.*3.5,6. but *Christ*, who is counted worthy of more glory

than

then *Moſes*, is the *Son* over his own Houſe, the true *Iſraelites* indeed, in whom is no guile; the Great and chief *Shepherd* over his own *ſheep*, who hear his voice; on whom the *ſervants* and their *Law*, *i.e. Moſes* and the *Angels*, have now nothing to do to impoſe, read *Heb.* 1. 1 *God who*, &c. to the end.

We ſee how the *Angels* are *inferior*, not only to the *Son* himſelf, the heir of all; but alſo (as *Miniſters* and *ſervants*) unto the leaſt of thoſe, who are heirs of Salvation, and of all things, both with, in and through him, whom yet *H.D.* repreſents as *inferiour* unto them, as thoſe, who are but on *Earth*, may be ſaid to be to ſuch as abide in *Heaven*: For when he comes on to tell of the *ſwearing of Chriſt* from the *Angels*, which *Angels* he ranks with *God* among ſuch as *ſwear in heaven*, *Come we* (quoth he) *to the Earth*; as if the Being of *Angels* were *onely in Heaven*, and the Being of *Chriſt only upon earth*; whereas that very *Angel* he inſtances in, as a Preſident of *Swearing* to us, is in that very place, *Rev.* 10. recorded as ſtanding no higher then on the *Sea*, and *Earth*; but *Chriſt* the *Son* (were *H.D.* capable to read the *myſtery* and riddle of it) had he ſworn in that *John* 3. 5. where *H.D.* reckons on him as *ſwearing on Earth*, might well have been rankt among the *ſwearers in Heaven*, being at that very preſent *in heaven*, as he ſaies himſelf *ver.* 13. *The Son of man which is in Heaven.*

But *H.D.* being yet where I once was with him, among thoſe who look for the *Kingdom of Heaven*, which is (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) *within men* (even thoſe men that never enter it, as Chriſt ſaid to the *Phariſees*, bidding his Diſciples not to *go forth* to look for it among them, who drew *outwards* with their *Lo here, and lo there*) in *outward obſervations*, with which it comes not, is ſo innocently ignorant where heaven is, that (though more *darkly* and *diminutively*, then ſome others, who open wider) in ſome degree (witneſs his two ſecret *jerks* at the *Quaker*, and the *Light within*, p. 5, and 8. of his perverting *Paper*) he rather *blaſphemes the name of God, and his Tabernacle*, i. e. the Light in which God dwells, is, and is known; and thoſe, (*i. e.* thoſe *Quakers*) *who dwell* with Chriſt *in Heaven.*

The

3 The next Argument then, *ab Exemplo* urg'd in proof of *swearing now*, is that of *Christ*, of whom *H.D.* and *J. I.* both do intimate it (as their *own conceit* at least) that he *swore*; and therefore *lawfully may we now, think* they. In evidence of his *thoughts* that *Christ swore*, *H.D.* alludes to *Joh.*3.5. saying (not *positively*, but *suppositively* onely, p.3.) *If the* Verily, Verily *of the Son of God, and our Redeemer, should not amount to so much as an* Oath, *as some think*; *yet is it more then a bare* Yea *and* Nay: In evidence of his *more confident conceit* and *thoughts* that *Christ* did *swore*, and consequently that we now may, *I. I.* cites and alludes to *Matth.*26.63. and that in two places of his *prittle prattle*, descanting as *emptily* as *amply* on it in them both, *viz.* p.2,3. and again p.7. whose words are here set down, that he may have no just occasion to say I wrong him in my Answer.

A man may be solemnly sworn when he is adjured by another, for to adjure (quoth he) *in plain English, is* to charge one to swear, *or* to exact an Oath, & *therefore we read* Mat.26.37. that *the High-Priest* Adjured Christ by the living God: Beza *more plainly reads it, that the High-Priest* charged him to swear by the living God, if *he were the Christ the Son of God*: So p.7. *Swearing was used by Christ himself*; *Mat.*26.36. the High-Priest adjures him by the living God; or *as it is in plain English*, he charged him to swear by the living God, *to tell him whether he was the Christ the Son of God*; which adjuration *Jesus answers*, Thou saist, or I am; for so it is (quoth he) *Mar.*14.62. *Now to answer to a matter when one is adjured by the living God, though it were but* Yea *and* Amen, *is swearing.*

Rep. To *H.D.* & *J.I.* I return *two things*; 1. That if *Christ* had sworn in the two *places* and *times respectively*, in which these two men seem to say he did; yet it proves not the *legality* of it now to us. 2. As 'tis but *doubtfully delivered* by themselves, so it's *utterly denyed* by me, that in these *cases*, *phrases*, and *places* of their alledging, *Christ* did *swear* at all. First, had Christs *Verily, Verily*, and his answering *I am*, when the *High-Priest* asked & charged him to tell him whether he were the *Christ*, amounted to a formal *Oath*, such as is now imposed and pleaded (but it was far from it; for there was no requiring to *lay his hand on a Book*, *and kiss it, and swear by God, and the Holy Evangelist*,

vangeliſt, and ſuch like; without which our preſent *Juſtices* will not own any man as giving ſufficient ſatisfaction or confirmation to end the ſtrife, let us ſpeak never ſo *ſolemnly* as in the ſight of the *living God*, but ſtrive endleſly with us, as *ſuſpitious perſons*, from whom the *King* can't be ſecured, unleſs we take the *Oath* in that old meer *ſhadowy* way) yet this was all in the time of the *Law*, and under it, before *Chriſt* by his death had put an *end* to it: For though in the *laſt* and *lateſt* of the two Terms which theſe two men take their texts and talk from, to prove Swearing *lawful* under the *Goſpel*, from *Chriſts Example*, he was ſo nigh it, as to be ſummon'd before the *Prieſts* in order to it; yet he was not *actually offered*, nor had as yet *actually ſuffered*, & ſo not *actually* put an end to the *Law*, which till he had, he was under the *Padagogy* of it, as the *Jews* were, and therefore might uſe ſome ſuch ſwearing as was uſed under the *Law*, and that be no warraut neither for us *now* to *ſwear*, who together with him that was once made *under* it himſelf, are *now* redeemed from under the *Law*, to under the *Goſpel*, and are *now* no more *under the Law*, but under *Grace*, *Rom.*6.14. *The Heir* himſelf *under age*, *differs not from a ſervant*, *though Lord of all*, *but is under* Tutors and Governors, *&c. ſo we*, *when children*, *were in bondage to the Elements of the world*; *but when the fulneſs of time was come*, *God ſent forth his Son*, *made of a woman*, *made under the Law*, *to redeem them that were under the Law*, *that we might receive the adoption of ſons*, *Gal.* 4.1, 2, 3, 4, 5. So that if Chriſt had ſworn before he was offered, yet to argue thus; *Chriſt while under the law*, *a little before he dyed*, *did ſwear*; *therefore may we* ſwear now *under the Goſpel*; is as poor a piece of proof, as to ſay, *Chriſt under the law before he dyed*, *was circumciſed*, *had two Turtles offered for him*, *eat the Paſſover juſt before he was betrayed*, *and was ſubject to other Rudiments and Ceremonies of the law*; *therefore we now muſt be circumciſed in fleſh*, *offer ſacrifice*, *eat the Paſſover carnally*, *and be ſubject to the other carnal Ordinances of the Law*, *in theſe dayes of the Goſpel.*

But *ſecondly*; Howbeit *H.W.* ſayes, *ſome* (of whom himſelf ſurely is one, or elſe it were ſilly in him to cite other mens *think-ſo's*, which are not his own, in proſecution of his own Argument) *do think that Chriſts* Verily, Verily, *was an*

Oath: Yet *verily*, and of a truth 'tis but their bare, *unwarrantable*, and *groundleſs thought*; which bare *thought* alſo *H.D.* is ſo far from backing with any matter of evidence to prove it ſound, that he rather falls back from it, ſinking through this meer *ſuppoſition*, (*viz.* If *Chriſts* Verily *be not an Oath*) at laſt into no other then this ſlender *Poſition*, (*viz.* Yet *its more then* Yea *and* Nay) In which he miſerably miſtakes himſelf too; for though (as to *degree*, which varies not the *nature* of any thing) it's a *more ſtrong* one, yet (as to its *nature*) its no more then a *ſtrong Aſſeveration*, which amounts no more to the *nature* of an *Oath*, then *Yea* or *Nay* does: Or if *H.D.* and others, who impoſe it upon us to ſwear, will needs have it ſo that *Verily, Verily*, is an *Oath*, we are willing to any truth we teſtifie, whether in an *Aſſertory*, or *Promiſory* way, before either *Magiſtrates*, or any other *men*, to do it under that form of *Verily, Verily*, might that be taken; but we have experience ſufficient, that *ſo much* as that, and *much more*, will in no wiſe ſatisfie *H.D.* who fights without an *Adverſary* in quarrelling with the *Quakers*, as un-free to ſay *verily, verily* (for they are free to that) or thoſe Magiſtrates whom the *Quakers* have to do with; for how free ſoe're any of us are to aſſure them with *Verily, Verily*, that is to ſay, *Truly, Truly*, which lyes in the *Yea*, that we have no evil intents toward the *now King*; and both truly and ſincerely to acknowledge him, before any other man, to be the right Heir to theſe his Kingdoms; and to profeſs, teſtifie and declare in our *Conſciences before* God and the World, againſt the *Pope*, *That the* Pope *neither of himſelf, nor by any Authority of the* Church or Sea of Rome, *or by any other means, hath any Power or Authority to depoſe the* King, *or to diſpoſe of any of his Kingdoms or Dominions, or to authoriſe any Forraign Prince to invade, or annoy him, or his Countreys or to diſcharge any of his Subjects of their obedience to him; or to give licenſe or leave to any of them to bear arms, raiſe tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Perſon, State or Government, or to any of his ſubjects within his Dominions; and to declare from our hearts, according to our often profeſſed and publiſhed* Principle, *That, notwithſtanding any Declaration, or ſentence of Excommunication or Deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted by the* Pope *or his ſucceſſors, or by any Authority*

Authority derived, or pretended to be derived from him or his Sea, against the ſaid King, his Heirs or Succeſſors, or any of the *Popes Abſolutions* of the ſaid Subjects from their obedience; yet we will be *faithful, truſty* and *peaceable* towards him and all men, &c, though for Conſcience-ſake we cannot take up Arms nor Carnal Weapons for our ſelves nor any man, yet in what ways we are capable with good Conſcience to God, we wil ſeek to ſecure him *againſt all Traiterous Conſpiracies and Attempts made againſt him or any man, by reaſon or colour of any ſuch Popiſh Sentence or Declaration*: *And to declare, that we do from our hearts abhor, deteſt and renounce as* Impious and Heretical, *this damnable Doctrine and Poſition, That Princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the* Pope, *may be deprived or murdered by their Subjects, or any other whatſoever*; And to declare *as in the ſight of God*, who is *Witneſs* that we *lye* not, and knows the *truth* of our hearts, and in *the preſence of the living God*, which *H. D.* ſays at leaſt is an *Oath*, (*for an* Oath *is nothing elſe but a Religious Promiſe*, quoth he, p. 3.) *our real intentions as much as is poſſible, and in us lies, to live peaceably with him and all men, and to wrong, injure, defraud* nor him, nor any man, &c. and to *ſubmit our ſelves to every Ordinance of man for the* Lords *ſake, whether* King *as Supream, or thoſe that are ſent of him for the puniſhment of evil-doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*; and to be ſubject in *Civil* things, to all *juſt Laws* made by that of *God* in the Conſcience; and where *unjuſt Laws* are made, to *ſuffer patiently* without *Rebellion* or *violent reſiſtance*; which is ſuch a *paſſive*, as is *equivalent* to other mens *active* obedience.

Yet all this, though moſt *ſubſtantial*, (if accepted by *H.D.*) ſhal in no wiſe be accepted by thoſe *Oath-Impoſers* with whom *H.D.* and *I.Ives* ſide againſt us, unleſs there be a conforming to the *Ceremonious Cuſtoms* of the Nations, which are *vain*, ſo as to *ſwear upon a Bible, and kiſs the Book, and lay one Finger* at leaſt upon it, and to be ſworn by *So help me God, and the Holy Evangeliſt*, and his *holy Goſpel*, which (though the *Copy* of it may) is more *ſpiritual* then to have *Carnal* hands laid on it, and a number of ſuch *ſuperſtitious ſuperfluities*, which iſſued forth from the Womb of that *diſmal Darkneſs*, which dwelt here in the time of the *Popes undue Power* over this Nation; which

Romish reliques all true *Protestants* against his *Peterdom*, may in these dayes of *Light* be asham'd of; yea, though they tell us it's *Oath* enough to *assert*, *deny*, or *promise* as *in Gods presence*, and to say, *God is Witness* that we lye not; yet if our Testimony be given forth freely from our selves in any such form as this; that is not *then* own'd for *swearing* by themselves who do so call it, if the *Book* be not *fingered*: Witness the case of one *Friend* call'd a *Quaker*, who calling *God to Witness*, See (quoth the *Magistrate*) he *swears*: But when the said *Friend* replyed thus; Wil ye take that for an *Oath*? 'twould not *then* be own'd as an *Oath* by the said *Magistrate* who so call'd it; and if any *Magistrate* in *this City* or *elsewhere*, upon the reading hereof, knows assuredly that I speak of *him*, I speak of *him* indeed.

2. Howbeit *J. Ives* (not for want of Ignorance) Asserts, That the *High-Priest's* charging of *Christ* by the living *God* to say whether he were the *Christ*, was a *charging Christ to swear*; and that *Christ* answering, when he was charged by him, did *swear*, and so that *Christ's answer* was an *Oath*; yet to any but such a one whom the *fear* of Suffering drives to *swear*, and the *shame* of *swearing* drives by *hook* or *crook* to defend it when he has done, These two things are clear enough: 1. That neither the *High-Priest* did command *Christ* to *swear*. 2. That *Christ* in his Answer to him did *not swear at all*, as *J. I.* more *cunningly* then *clearly* suggests he did. *J. I.* saies the *High-Priest adjured him by the living God*; or (as it is (quoth he) in plain English) *he charged him to swear by the living God*. 2. That to this *Adjuration* Jesus answers, *Thou sayest*, or *I am*; and so *sware*.

Rep. Both these *two* things are false. 1. The *High-Priest did not charge him to swear by the living God*. 2. He did *not swear by the living God*.

In proof of the first, that the *High-Priest* did charge *Christ* to *swear*, *J. I.* insists at large on the word *adjure*; for to *adjure* (quoth he *p.* 2.) in *plain English is to charge one to swear*; or, *to exact an Oath*: The *High-Priest adjured Christ by, &c. Beza* (quoth he) *more plainly reads it, Charged him to swear by the living God*.

Rep. Both *J. I.* and *Beza* also are besides the business; for how-

howbeit the *Greek* word ἐξορκίζω is Engliſht, *I Adjure*, yet it's not abſolutely neceſſary it ſhould be ſo (as it muſt be, if it be *demonſtrative* of *J. Is Aſſertion*) but as it *may* and *doth* ſignifie ſtrictly to *Adjure*; ſo it *properly may*, and *often doth* ſignifie to *charge*, *command*, or *oblige one*, as by *Word*, or *Promiſe* onely: for ὁρκίζω being either of εἶργω to *confine*: or (as ſome) of ὅρος a *bound*, or *limit*; ſignifies *originally* to *bind*, *limit*, *confine*, or *engage one* any way; *viz.* as by bare promiſe as well as Oath: And no leſs doth *Jo. Tombs* in a manner plainly intimate and confeſs, to the *confutation* of himſelf in his *Trivial* talk *for ſwearing*, by ſaying that *Pauls charge* to the Church, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. where the word ὁρκίζω is uſed and rendered I *Charge*; & thoſe his two *charges* to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 13. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. where the words διαμαρτύρομαι and παραγγέλλω are uſed, & *Engliſhed*, *I charge*, are all alike; for the two laſt *Greek* words are at moſt no more then to *engage* one, as in the ſight of ſome *Witneſs*, (*God* or *Man*) or ſolemnly to *charge* or *command*, not ſo *ſtrictly* as to *ſwear one*, though ὁρκίζω may be taken in the more *moderate* ſenſe, *i. e.* any way to *charge one*, as well as in that rigid way of *ſwearing*, and is at moſt no more then thus, *viz. I enjoin thee as ſtrictly as if thou hadſt promiſed or ſworn.*

Moreover its moſt evident to the contradiction of *J. Ives* and *Beza* alſo, from whom, and *Ainſworths* meer *Opinion*, if not *male-Conſtruction*, he furtively fetches two or three of his *ſorry ſhifts*, wherewith to *ſalve* the *abſurdity* of his own *ſorry ſayings*; that to *adjure* (if we render ὁρκίζω in that *ſtrict ſenſe*) is not (as *J. I.* ſayes it is) *in plain Engliſh to charge one to ſwear*, *or exact an Oath*; and that the *High-Prieſt* did not (as *Beza* ſayes he did) *charge Chriſt to ſwear by the living God*: For if the phraſe *I adjure thee by God*, be to *charge* or *command* one to *ſwear by God*, then to ſay *I adjure* thee by *Jeſus*, is to *command* one to *ſwear by Jeſus*; which ſence is as *abſurd*, as 'twould be *moſt abſurd* to read that paſſage where the *Vagabond Jews* imitating *Paul*, *charged* the evil ſpirits in the *Name of Jeſus* to come out of men, *Acts* 19. 12, 13. thus, *viz. We charge you to ſwear by Jeſus whom Paul preacheth*; for 'twould ſuppoſe the whole *deſign* of thoſe *Exorciſts* was to cauſe the evil ſpirits to *ſwear by Jeſus*, whereas their *deſign* was to cauſe them to *depart* out of the men; and 'twould ſuppoſe that the commands of

Paul,

Paul; *Acts* 16.18. 1 *Theſſ.*5.27. 1 *Tim.*6.13.17. 2 *Tim.*4.1.who ſayes to the *Theſſalonians*, to *Timothy*, to the *Spirit of Divination* (reſpectively) ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς, παραγγέλλω σὲ, διαμαρτύρομαι, *I adjure* or *charge you that this Epiſtle be read*, &c. *I charge thee in the ſight of God, or before God and Chriſt, that thou preach, that thou keep the Command without ſpot, that thou come out of the Maid*, (which *Jo. Tombs* himſelf ſays were *charges* all alike) I ſay, 'twould ſuppoſe that *Pauls* charges there, were not *charges* of the foreſaid *charged ones*, to do the things which he commanded them to do *reſpectively*; but *commands* or *charges* of them only to *ſwear by God and Chriſt Jeſus*, that they would do them; which to ſuppoſe, is *abſurdity* in the *abſtract*.

It being ſo then (as is evident againſt *J. Ives* bare *conjecture* to the contrary) that to ſay, *I adjure*, or *charge thee By, Before*, or *in the ſight of the living God*, is not *I charge thee to ſwear by the living God*, or I exact an *Oath* of thee; it wil conſequently follow, that to anſwer *Yea*, or *Nay* to him that ſhould ſay, *I adjure*, or *charge thee before God* to ſpeak to a Caſe in Queſtion, is not *to ſwear*, or to *take an Oath*, as *J. I.* ſuppoſes (who (put his words together) ſaies, *To anſwer to a matter when one is Adjured*, alias, *Charged by the living God, though it were but* Yea, *or* Nay, *or* Amen, *is as ſolemn an Oath, as if one ſware by the living God with his own mouth. That if the Judge in our* Common-Law *ask a queſtion of a party ſworn, and teſtifying his conſent to the* Oath, *by his kiſſing and laying his hand on the Book, and the party do but anſwer, and give in his teſtimony in naked aſſertions, without ſaying*, I ſwear by the Lord, *or* by the Oath I have taken, *or the like, his bare anſwering to the Queſtion, is as much as if he had pronounced an Oath with the higheſt aſſeverations that could be thought on*, p. 3, 4.) as *J. I.* (having pinn'd his Faith firſt upon *Ainſworths* ſleeve) ſaies p. 3. *He could wiſh this were ſeriouſly conſidered by thoſe that make conſcience of Oaths*, as if himſelf were now grown paſt making *conſcience* of them, ſo I could wiſh this were as *ſeriouſly* conſidered by *J. I.* himſelf, and thoſe whom he would have to make *no conſcience of Oaths*, that if it be ſo as *J. I.* aſſerts it is in our *Common Courts*, then ſo many *ſeveral anſwers* as the party (once *ſworn*) makes by *Yea*, or *Nay*, to the Judges queſtions, ſo many

ny *several Oaths* with the *highest asseverations* that can be, are by him taken; and so if he answer *Yea*, or *Nay*, an hundred times, being so many times askt in the case in hand (as one Witness may be at one Court) he takes no less then an hundred *solemn Oaths*, and so his first *Oath* (he once assenting to swear) like sin, which is ever of a multiplying nature, when man once begins to fall under it, spawns it self quickly into an hundred; and *considerat is considerandis*, our *Courts of Judicature*, which *H. D.* and *J. I.* will both confess ought to be places of punishment for that *common swearing*, or *swearing commonly, ordinarily, wholly, frequently* (as *H. D.* frivolously descants upon that phrase of Christ, *Swear not at all, Mat.* 5.) which ordinary, common, frequent Swearing all men grant also Christ there forbids, will rather appear to be the most *common places* of *swearing commonly, frequently, ordinarily*, that are in all the Land beside them. And besides *J. I.*'s instance in the *Oath* in our *Common Law*, reaches not the case he brings it in evidence of; for there the party answering is supposed by *J. I.* first to be *sworn by his own consent*, and then to answer *yea* or *nay*; but the case in hand supposes the party onely answering *yea* or *nay*, to one that saies, *I adjure thee*, without shewing his *consent* to the others *adjuration*, by that *assenting Ceremony*, which *J. I.* when he was charged to *swear*, declared his *assent* by, of *kissing* and *fingering* of a *Bible*; which if *J. I.* (for *customs sake*) had not done, he would have found the Court he *sware in*, would not have counted him a *person sworn* sufficiently to their satisfaction, had they said, We *adjure thee*, we *charge thee* to tell us whether thou *renounce the Pope*, and wilt be *true to the King, yea or nay*, and *J. I.* answered, *yea*, or *I will*, no less then an hundred times over.

So we see that if *Christ* had answered, *I am* (as *Fr. Ives falsly* sayes he did) to the *High Priest*, when he said, I *adjure thee by the living God to tell me whether thou be the Christ, or not*, he had not *sworn*; sith by that word, *I adjure thee*, he said (in effect) no more then *I command*, or *charge thee*, as *in Gods presence*, as strictly as if thou hadst *promised* or *sworn*; and its silly to think that Christ who sayes, *Swear not at all*, no not by *Heaven, for its Gods throne*, which whoso *swears* by, *swears* by him, even *God that sits thereon*, *Matth.* 18. would *swear*

by

by the *living God* that he was the *Christ*, at the command or *charge* of the *High-Priest* that was his *Inferior*, (as being but the *Type* of himself) to tell him whether he was so or no.

But *secondly*, in very deed when all is done, there's no such matter as *J. I.* affirms; for when the *Priest barely asked* him onely whether he was the *Christ*, or not; he answered, *I am*: In that place of *J. I*'s own quoting (which had he not been in haste, he might have seen also *Mark* 14.7.) but when the *Priest* said, *I adjure thee by the living God*, he is recorded by *Matthew*, *Mat.*26.63. as answering not, *I am* (as *J. I.* saies he did) but *Thou saiest*; which seems to be a waving of all *positive answer*, rather then such a *positive answer*, as, *I am*; which yet had he said, he had not sworn. Thus as he that's *blind cannot see*; so he who is not *cannot but see* the shuffling ways whereby *H D*, but specially *J. I.* seeks to prove Christ to have sworn, that he may shroud and shelter himself from the storm of his guilty Conscience, under some Shrub, under a shadowy shew of Christ's example, when he had stooped to mans command, contrarily unto Christ's.

The other examples from whence *H.D.* and *J. Ives* endeavour to prove the lawfulness of *swearing now*, are those of *Kings*, *Priests*, *Prophets*, *righteous and holy men of God in old time*, as *Abimelech*, *Abraham*, *David*, *and others*; *in which they belabour* themselves to no purpose, since this was all under the *Law*, under which (among those that were under it) we deny not that *swearing* to be in use, which hath now no use nor place among them that are not under the *dominion* of the *Law*, but *under Grace*, and the *teachings*, *power* and *dominion* of *Gods Grace*, which redeems from the *strife*, and other fleshly works, which it is one of: Which consideration confutes *J. I*'s *Fifth Reason for swearing*, viz. *Because strife continuing still there's as much need of* Oaths, *the use of which is to end it*, *as ever there was*; quoting *Heb.*6.16. *An* Oath *among men for confirmation*, *is an end of all* strife.

Rep. 1. To say nothing how much our *Courts* are in that case of *Tythes*, beside the *end* of *Oaths*, if that be the true *end* thereof, to *end strife*; since they use *Oaths* to *begin* the *strife* with; for if a man will not swear how many *Hops*, and *Ducks*, and *Hens*, and *Eggs*, and *Pigs*, *&c.* he hath had in so many years together, they admit him not to answer to his *Plaintiff*.

An

An *Oath* when uſed to its right end, *i. e.* to *end ſtrife*, is ſo uſed *among men* onely in the fall, who live in *hatred*, *variance*, *ſtrife*, and ſuch deeds of darkneſs and the fleſh, but not *among the Saints*, that are ſaved from it, and live in *love* and *peace*, and do (as *Chriſt Diſciples* are bid to do) to others as they would be *done* by, and no evil nor injury to any, which they would not have done to themſelves, which is the *ſum* of the *Law* and the *Prophets*, &c. For here both the *Law*, which is owned by us as good in its place; but is not for the *righteous*, but the *wrighteous*, and *murderers*, *ſtealers*, *&c.* hath no place, nor *Oaths*, nor *Lawyers* neither, who can live no longer in that calling of theirs, which they much corrupt and ſpoil, as *blind Prieſts* do the *Goſpel*, then while men live in *treſpaſſes* and *ſins*; For if men live by the *light* of *Gods grace* in their own hearts, which hath appeared to all men, bringing ſalvation to them from the ſin, leading and teaching ſuch as learn of it, *to deny ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and to live godly, righteouſly and ſoberly in this preſent world*; they will need no longer (as the World doth, while it chuſes to lie in Wickedneſs, and in the bondage of its own corruption) to throw away their eſtates on *Lawyers*, to end their *ſtrifes* about them, nor to be ſuch *ſlaves* to their own wills and luſts, as to ſpend 20. *l.* upon *them*, to recover 20. *s.* for *themſelves*; but will ſee (as ſome have done who have been where others now are) the way out of *ſtrife*, which is *the Light*; and come to that *love*, *innocency*, *honeſty*, *righteouſneſs*, *peace* and *pity* to themſelves, and one another, as ſhall *end all ſtrife* without *Oath*, or more ado: Yea to *ſee* that in the *Light* of the *Goſpel*, which under the *Law* was not ſeen by *Prophets* and *righteous men*, while under that *Padagogy*: Yea, as *Chriſt* ſaid to his *Diſciples*, ſo ſay I to thoſe that are turn'd to learn of him *now*; *Bleſſed are your eyes, for they ſee, and your ears, for they hear; for verily I ſay unto you, that many Prophets and Righteous men in former dayes of the Law, have deſired to ſee and hear thoſe things which ye do, and yet have neither ſeen nor heard them.*

And this above may ſerve for a return to *H. D.* who inſiſts much on it, that *this Teſtimony that an* an Oath *is to* end ſtrife, *is* after the Law; *the Apoſtle ſayes men* do ſwear; *and I have writ-*

ten do ſwear *(quoth he) becauſe the Greek word* Heb. 6. 16: *is in the preſent tenſe, and the rather, becauſe one Preacher, perſwading his Hearers againſt* all ſwearing, *told them it ought to be read* did ſwear, *and* was a confirmation, *not* is.

Rep. Who that was, I know not; I can afford to grant it's written *do* and *is*, and yet give *H.D.* and *J. Ives* no ground in their controverſie againſt us; againſt whom in two reſpects that conſideration of *Oaths* being uſed in *Pauls* time, can't prove the *lawfulneſs* of them *among the Saints*, either *then* or *now*; there were many *cuſtoms* in uſe, and contended for by many *Naturaliſts*, about which the Apoſtle ſays, *But if any man liſt to be contentious; yet we have no ſuch cuſtom, nor the Churches of God.* 'Tis but *among men* ſtill, though 'twas in the *Apoſtles dayes*, and *now* is, and not *among the Saints* and *true Churches of God*, which are *in God*, who is *light* and *love*, and not in the *enmity*, the *curſe* and *ſtrife*, where the *oaths* are uſed; among men *under the Law*, and ſo *under the curſe*, as all are that live in *ſin* and *ſtrife*, but not among Saints, who walk and live in, and are led by the Spirit, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, *love, joy, peace, meekneſs, &c.* ſuch are not *under the Law*, but Graces and *againſt ſuch there is no Law*, *Rom.* 6.14. *Gal.* 5.18.23.

But *H.D.* and *I.I.* makes much a-do, to as little effect, to evince it, that the *Apoſtle Paul* himſelf *ſware*, yea and that very *frequently* too: *Some have noted it* (quoth *H.D.* p.5.) *as frequent with the* Apoſtle *Paul in ſerious matters to uſe ſuch expreſſions as are equivalent to an* Oath, as Rom.1.9. God is my Witneſs *whom I ſerve, &c. with many more of the like nature, which are well known to you. And* quoth *J. I.* pag.9. 10. (as one of his brown-paper Pellets againſt our proof of *no ſwaring*, from Matth.5.34. *)ſome ſuch ſwearing as was commanded under the Law, not onely Chriſt, but the Apoſtle* Paul *did both practice and enjoyn*, uſing his words, 2 *Cor.*11.19. *As the truth of Chriſt is in me*, Rom.1.9. *God is Witneſs.* Phil.1.8. *God is my record.* 1 Cor. 1. 23. I *call God to record upon my ſoul.* Rom. 9. 1. *I ſpeak the truth by Chriſt*, (quoth J. *I.* becauſe *Beza* ſayes ſo; though it is ἐν χριϛῳ, *in* Chriſt, moſt properly in the Greek) *I lye not, my Conſcience beareth me witneſſe in the holy Spirit*; (there he renders

ders is right, *in*, and not *by*; and why not in the former part of the verse?) Gal. 1.20. *Before God I lye not*: *And as they practis'd swearing, so they did exact it in the like solemn cases upon others; for to adjure* (quoth J.I.) *is to exact an oath, or charge one to swear*, 2 Tim. 4.1. Paul *charged* Timothy *before God*; and Thess. 1. 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord that this Epistle be read*; Beza *reads it* Adjuro vos per Dominum, *I charge thee to swear by the Lord*: to this agrees that of the *High-Priest who adjured Christ*. Now if all swearing *now* were forbidden by those two Texts, *Mat.* 5.34. *Jam.* 5.12. the *Apostle would neither have done it, nor charged others so to do.*

Rep. 1. That to use such expressions as these above was frequent with the Apostle is well known to us indeed, as *H. D.* saies; but that this was at all *such swearing* as is contended for by *H. D.* and *J. I.* who hath *sworn upon a Book, and kissed it* (as the custom is) I am yet ignorant, and yet not so ignorant as to give such an Answer as *J. I.* saies *some do for want of a better*, viz. *That the Apostle did evil in swearing*; for I as verily believe, as *J. I.* saith he himself doth in the same place, *That he that will swear wickedly, and contrary to Gods Law* (& so he does in my judgment that *swears at all*, sith *Christ*, *Mat.* 5.33.34, &c. forbids it ὅλως *omnino*, *in any wise*, or *altogether*) the same wil *Lye* also upon occasion: yea 'tis my Faith, and the Faith of some who are set to *swear others* also, that thousands of those who now *swear out* their *present* and *future faithfulneß* to the *King*, for fear of some *malicious Magistrate* that exacts it, out of *envy* more then any true love to him, would *for all their swearing* prove more *unfaithful*, if occasion should happen suitably to their hopes of *insurrection in arms* against him, then those *Thousands* of *Quakers* who living in the *true fear* and *love* of God, can in conscience neither for *fear* or *love* of themselves or any man, either *take up arms* at all for themselves against *King*, or *any man*, or, to escape the loss of all they have, *swear at all.*

But the Answer I give shal be as follows:

1. Some things (though *swearing* is none of them) *Paul* did by *permission then*, which we are not *now* to do because he did them, witness his *circumcising Timothy*, *shaving his head and*

taking a Vow upon him according to the Law, Act. 16.3. 21,23,24, 25. which things were parts of the Law, then *(by right)* abolished, in favour of the *Jewes* weakness, who yet could not bear the *actual abolition* of them: For *as for the Gentiles that believe we command* (say the Apostles) *that they observe no such thing*: So that if *Oaths* had then been (*de facto*) used by the *Apostles*, that *of it self* would not prove they *now* are (*de jure*) to be used by us.

But 2. That *Paul* either *sware*, or *exacted Oaths* upon others I deny.

1. As to his not *enjoining* or *exacting swearing* on others, which *J. I.* draws by the head and shoulders from the place where *Paul* saies to the *Thessalonians* and *Timothy*, *I charge you by the Lord*, *I charge thee before the Lord* (in *which places* (quoth he) he *charges them to swear by the Lord*) I have said so much before, that here I shall add onely this consideration, *viz.* That *Paul* did not *charge them to swear* there, but to *read his Epistle*, and to *preach the Word*. 2. If he had commanded them to *Swear*, or *exacted an Oath* of them, his command was not answered by them; For shal we think the *Thessalonians* did *swear* to him, that they would *read his Epistle*, before they did read it, or that *Timothy sware* to him that he would *preach the Word*, before he preached it? Or if they *sware* not to him, did they *swear* before any other that were his *Proxies* at that distance which they were in from him, who was at *Athens* when he wrote to the *Thessalonians*, and at *Rome* when he wrote to *Timothy*, then Bishop among the *Ephesians*? And if there were no *Representatives* of his person then with them, to tender the *Oath* to them, then it appears, That *J. I*'s eies are out, who cannot see that the *commands of Paul* to them, which they (*respectively*) obeyed, were to *read his Epistle*, and *preach the Word*, and not to *swear* that they would do so.

2*dly*, As to *Pauls* own *swearing*, though I will not say (as J. I. sayes some say) he *did evil in swearing*; (for he *sware* not) yet in *swearing* he had done evil, had he sworn in those many expressions wherein *H. D.* and *J. I.* assert he *did swear*; and no less then this, *H. D.* and *J. I.* must be forced to confesse with me (if each of them will *own* his *own Book* in other places)

ces) for *H.D.* and *J.I.* (as busie as they be in banding against our interpretation of Christs Prohibition *universally* against *swearing at all*, allowing swearing only before Magistrates to end strife) yet they both confess, that at least it extends to the forbidding of *ordinary*, *frequent*, or *common swearing*, or *swearing* in our *common communication*, when we are not called *before Magistrates*: But if *Paul* did swear so often as J.*I* presents him to us *as swearing*, in the many *Epistles* of *Paul* above cited by him; and if it were so *frequent with* Paul *to use expressions equal to an* Oath (that is to say, to use *Oaths*) as *H.D.* says *some have noted*, it was from *Rom.*1.9. *with many more of like nature*; then he had come under the guilt of that, *swearing commonly, ordinarily, frequently*, or in his *common communication* with the Saints, and in his Letters to them, uncall'd to it by any *Magistrate*; which kind of *swearing*, these two *strict sticklers* for *Oaths* in some cases, do both confess, are by Christ *Matt.* 5.33.34. condemned and forbidden.

Obj. But quoth J.*I.* p.10. If *calling God to witness what we say, be not* swearing, *I confess I am ignorant what* swearing *is*; *but if it be, then it was not onely used under the old, but under the New-Testament.*

Rep. If it be not, then J.I. stands condemned here under his own hand, as ignorant of what *Swearing is*, and so is unfit to meddle so much as he hath done in that matter, who (witness his Title-page) takes on him to open that *great Case of Conscience* about the *lawfulness* or *unlawfulness* of *swearing*: *But if it be*, then (methinks) *H.D.* and J.I. should sit still, and save themselves the labour of writing so much as they do against the *Quakers*, in vindication of the *lawfulness* of *some swearing*; for *such swearing* (if they will needs have it to be swearing) as *Paul* used when he said, *God is my witness*; *God is my record*; *I call God to record*; *I speak the truth in Christ*, *I lye not*; *my Conscience beareth me witness in the holy Spirit*; and such like, the *Quakers* gainsay in solemn cases no more then themselves; yet they have put themselves to so much pains, as to prove the *lawfulness* of that, the *lawfulness* of which, we know none that do deny. 2*dly*. If *it be*, then, methinks the *wise*, *prudent* and *potent imposers* of the *Oath* upon the *Quakers*, and others,

others, who have been ever willing to expreſs their *Renuntiations of the Pope*, and *all forreign Powers*, and their *Fidelity to the King*, by any of thoſe *ſtrong Aſſeverations*, or *fervent Expreſſions* which *Paul* uſed, and J.I. calleth *Oaths*, ſhould accept of the like from them; but that they neither do, nor will, as they would not have accepted the like from *Jer. Ives* himſelf, ſo as to have excuſed him from falling under the danger of the like *Premunire* with ſuch as cannot conform to that *ceremonious* kind of *ſwearing*, which he hath ſworn in, without *kiſſing*, and *laying* one of their fingers at leaſt upon a *Bible*,

Object. But, quoth J. I. *if any one ſhould confirm the truth of what he ſpeaks, after this rate* (meaning the *rate* at which *Paul* ſpake in the places fore-cited) *what did he leſs then* Swearing? *However it were more then* Yea *and* Nay.

Reply; If it was more then *Yea* and *Nay*, as it was in ſound of words, but not in ſubſtance, (*yea* and *nay* being ſpoken ſolemnly as in Gods ſight, amounting in ſubſtance to no leſs then all that) yet it was leſs then *ſwearing*, however leſs then ſuch *formal, cuſtomary, ceremonious, ſuperſtitious ſwearing*, as that J.I. is found in, which was no leſs *fooliſh, needleſs, vain* and *ſuperfluous*, then it was *ſuperſtitious*, if leſs then that of *touching* and *kiſſing* the *Book* (as aforeſaid) might in the Court (where he was *ſworn*) have paſſed for *ſwearing*.

So then all *H.D.*'s and *J.I.*'s inſtances in proof of *Oaths*, being practis'd and uſed in *old time, before Chriſt*, and *ſince*, prove altogether uſeleſs to that purpoſe.

Obj. But (quoth *H.D.* p.4.) *it is warranted not onely by* Practice, *but by* Precept *alſo*, Deut. 6. 13. *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, and ſerve him, and ſhalt ſwear by his Name.*

Rep. Under the Law it was (as other *types, ſhadows* and *ceremonies* alſo were) warranted not by *practice* onely, but *precept* alſo; but ſtill we demand, where is there either *practice* of it, or *precept* for it among *Chriſt* and his *Diſciples* under the *Goſpel*? If there had been any *precept* for it (for *practice* of it, I have proved there was none) among any but *men* (yet *degenerate*) in the *New-Teſtament* ſince the death of *Chriſt*, we ſhould ſurely have had it cited by *H.D.* in *this*, wherein he

ſtood

ſtood concern'd to have cited it above all other *places* of his *Paper-work*; but ſince he *mentions none* here, we may ſafely take it for granted he had *none to mention*; and ſince *H.D.* among all his *Old-Teſtament-talk for ſwearing* (which had been better *ſpar'd* then *ſpilt* in proof of what none denies) nor *does*, nor *can poſſibly* produce one *pittance* of a *precept* for it in the *New*; we ſhall rather adhere to *Chriſts* and his *Apoſtles plain precept againſt it*, or *poſitive prohibition* of it, in the two Texts, which theſe two men, *H.D.* and J. I. (as will be ſeen anon) *traduce*, *Mat.*5.33,34.&c. *Jam.*5.12. then either to *H.D*'s *nameleſs* Scripture-*Precepts*, or J.I.'s *deceitful*, *ſelf-ſaving* ſhuffles, for a practice that is *now* as flatly forbidden (with other *ceremonial cuſtoms* of the *Law*) in the *Goſpel*, as ever it was required in the *Law*.

Obj. It is alſo confirmed by Propheſies (quoth *H.D.* p.4.) the *Prophets* propheſie *that* ſome ſwearing *ſhall be uſed in the time of the New Teſtament* (quoth J. *I.* p. 9. of his piece of proof) and to make good their ground againſt us who plead *Chriſts Precepts*, both theſe two Archers who plead *old propheſies*, 1. Unite their ſtrength, and diſcharge at us with one *ſingle ſtring*. *2ly.* Leſt that ſhould prove too ſlender for it, one of them *viz.* J. *I.* has two more *ſtrings* to his *Bow*, wherewith he hopes to carry the Cauſe without controul. 1. They jointly urge that *one propheſie*, *Iſai.* 65. 16. *He that ſweareth in the earth ſhall ſwear by the God of Truth, becauſe the former troubles are forgotten, &c.* the meer mention of vvhich *H. D.* deems enough, and therefore *actually* urges nothing from it; but J. *I.* dilates at large upon it, inſiſting o're and o're on that circumſtance of time vvhich *H. D.* hints (as that vvhere the ſtreſs lyes) vvhich J. *I.* thinks clears his caſe beyond *all controverſie*. *Here's a prophecie* (quoth J. I.) *that foretells ſome* ſvvearing *ſhall be lawful in thoſe times that are to come*; *after the Aſcention of Chriſt, and the death of the Apoſtle James*, then *he that ſwears ſhall ſwear by the God of Truth*, THEN *when the former troubles are forgotten*, *When ſhall that be?* the 17 ver. reſolvs us, *It ſhall be when the New Heavens and the New Earth are created, and the former Heaven and Earth is forgotten*; *So that here is a Concatenation of Divine Truths*; *Men ſhall ſwear by the God of*

Tru

Truth, becauſe the former troubles are forgotten; their former troubles ſhall be forgotten, becauſe the former Heaven and Earth ſhall be forgotten: That this propheſie reſpected the times of the New-Teſtament, let Peter witneſs, 2 Pet. 3. 13. *We look for a new Heaven, and a new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteouſneſs: So that theſe Scriptures foretell, that though under the former Heavens, and upon the former Earth men ſware by falſe Gods; yet in the times of the new Heavens and new Earth, wherein dwelleth* Righteouſneſs, *men ſhall ſwear by the God of Righteouſneſs.* To all which, ſomewhat muſt be ſaid by way of Reply.

Reply; That this is ſpoken with reference to the time of the *new Heavens and Earth*, I deny not; but I deny that this clauſe, *He that ſweareth ſhall ſwear by the God of Truth*, is underſtood of *ſwearing* at all (*formally* and *properly* ſo taken) much leſs (as *J. I.* ſayes 'tis) of ſuch *ceremonious ſwearing*, as was *under the Law*, and as *J. I.* (contrary to his former profeſſions, as I have heard) conforms himſelf to now in *this day of the Goſpel.*

1. Becauſe often the *name* and *phraſe*, which is *peculiar* and *proper* only to the *Type under the Law*, is by the Prophets ſpeaking of the times of the *Goſpel*, attributed to the *Anti-type* or *Thing* it ſelf thereby *deciphered*; yea how ordinary and uſual was it with the moſt *Evangelical Prophets* to ſpeak of *Evangelical* matters under the (*then*) *uſual*, though but *legal phraſes*, and to hold forth the *ſubſtantial, eternal* and *everlaſting Goſpel truths*, under the *dark, ſhadowy* forms of *ceremonious* and *legal* phraſes, which if any ſhould now interpret as ſpoken of the meer *ceremony* or *figure*, by the name of which the *truth figured out onely* with reference to *Goſpel* times is expreſs'd; one might thereby uſher in well nigh the whole bulk of *outward eatings, drinkings, divers baptiſms, circumciſion, paſſeover, ſacrifices, and other carnal ordinances* and *ceremonious Rites*, which belonged to that *Padagogy* of the *Jews*, as well as that *ceremony* of *ſwearing.*

See *Jer.* 31. and compare *v* 31. 32. 33. which none deny to be ſpoken of the *Goſpel glory*, which tranſcends that of the *Law*, which is done away (though a *glory*) with *v.* 38. 39. 40. Will any take that as ſpoken of the old *legal Jeruſalem*, that was in *bondage with her children*, and not of that onely which is *above*, and

free, and the *Mother* of all Saints; for it's not a *truth* of the other, for it (though built after the *Babyloniſh* ruines) was *pluckt* up, and *thrown down again*.

So *Zach.*14 from *v.*9.10. to the end.

How are the *Pots of the Lords Houſe* now as bright as the Golden *bowles before the Altar*; but as thoſe that have *lien among the pots* (as black as they have been) ſhall be as a *Dove covered with ſilver, and her feathers with yellow gold.*

So *Ezek.*36.25. There ſpeaking of the Goſpel purity, *I will ſprinkle clean water upon you, and ye ſhall be clean.* Will any think this is that water onely that puts away the *outward filth* of the *outward fleſh*?

So *Ezek.*40. to the end of that *Propheſie*; The *Temple Worſhip, Sacrifices, & orders of the holy City*, of which its ſaid, *Jehovah Shammah*, the *Lord is there*, are deſcribed under the *legal phraſes*, and according to the old *ceremonial orders*: Will the *Baptiſt* think therefore there's a *material Temple* made with hands? *Rev.*21. confuteth him, where its ſaid, *I ſaw no* Temple *there; but the Lord God and the Lamb are the* Temple *of it.*

An hundred more there are of the like nature; yea all the *Prophets* ſpeak *over* the *external type* and *ceremony* of that *eternal Truth*, which is *one, one ſacrifice, one paſſeover, one oath of God*, which ends all *ſtrife* and *wrath* to ſuch as look to it, *one circumciſion* for ever; and yet under the name of the *temporal Type* onely which was in the times of the Law, wherein they wrote, and wherein thoſe were uſed.

That of *Circumciſion* was calld an *everlaſting Covenant*, and an *everlaſting ſign* in the fleſh of *Abrahams* Seed; yet we are that *Seed*, that *Circumciſion*, they but the *Conciſion*, and the *baſtard Seed* of ſcoffing *Iſhmael*, not of *Iſaac*, nor of *Iſrael*; yea in that very place of theſe mens quoting, and thoſe following, many things are ſaid, which (in *words*) found out the *Laws*, by which is intended onely the *Goſpel-ſervices*, and the *Goſpel-ſuperſtitions*; *He that ſacrificeth a Lamb, cuts off a Dogs neck*; *He that burns Incenſe, bleſſes an Idol, now*, as well as *then*, if his *ſoul delight in abomination*; yet the *Sacrifices* and *Incenſe now*, is not of *fed Beaſts*, and *ſweet ſmells*, but *prayers* and *praiſes*, which who offers to God from an unclean conſcience, is

in it *abomination to the Lord*, as the *ſacrifice of the wicked* is ever ſaid to be, Prov.15.8. *They that eat Swines fleſh, and the abomination, and the Mouſe, ſhall be conſumed*, in the *Anti-type* thats done in theſe dayes, to which that Propheſie *ultimately* relates: I *create Jeruſalem a rejoicing, her people a joy*; yet the *Jeruſalem* which *then* was, is now a *curſe among* Gods *choſen*, and her *Name* tranſlated unto theſe: Semblably he that *ſweareth* in thoſe days, *ſhall ſwear by the* God *of truth*, is not ſpoken of the *Ceremony* which theſe times practice, and theſe men plead for; but of a *ſubſtance*, a *ſpeaking*, (though calld by that name of *ſwearing*, which was the *ſhadow*) the *truth from the heart*, a *ſpeaking in righteouſneſs* (though by no more then *yea* & *nay*) in his ſight, in whom Gods *oath* and *promiſes* are all *yea*, or *truth* it ſelf; as Chriſt is ſaid to do, of whom the Saints are, Iſa.63.1. a *ſaying*, (though call'd a *ſwearing*) the *Lord liveth*, in *truth*, and in *righteouſneſs* in theſe days, by ſuch as know their *Redeemer living*. In old time there was a *ſaying*, calld alſo a *ſwearing*, *the Lord liveth*, in *falſhood*, *unrighteouſneſs* and *deceit*, by ſuch as know him not living in themſelves, of whom God ſayes, *Though ye ſay God lives, yet ye ſwear falſly*; *i. e.* who though ye ſay the truth, yet ye know not that to be truth which ye ſay, while ye ſay it, not feeling him living in your ſelves. Men *ſware then* by the God of Truth in a *ſound of words*, and *ceremonious* forms (though J.I. ſayes they ſware by falſe Gods, as if they had not at all ſware by the God of Truth) but they did not ſwear by him in truth and righteouſneſs when they mentioned his Name, but in deceit, as a company of hypocrites; ſo that God counted them as ſwearing falſly, when they uttered the very truth.

And that *thoſe Oaths* theſe men plead as neceſſary to end ſtrife, are in no wiſe meant here, is evident by that very *circumſtance* on which they inſiſt moſt ſtrictly in proof thereof, if conſidered but a little more exactly. For 1. whereas they both intimate it, and *J.I.* very *ſtremuouſly* urges it as a clauſe *neceſſarily* clearing the preſent *lawful uſe* of *ſuch oaths*, becauſe 'tis foretold there ſhall be *ſuch ſwearing*; at *that time* (ſayes *H.D.*) *THEN*, yea *THEN* (ſayes J.I.) when *Jacob* and *Judahs former troubles*, and the *former Heavens and Earth* ſhall

ſhall be forgotten, in the *new Heavens and Earth wherein dwelleth righteouſneſs*, Any of thoſe *wiſe men* whoſe *eyes* are in their *head* when the *fools* are *abroad* in *the ends* of the Earth, would from that ſelf-ſame clauſe have ſeen clear ground to conclude no leſs then the *very contrary*, i. e. the *unlawfulneſs*, becauſe the utter *uſeleſneſs* of any *ſuch oaths* at all in *thoſe dayes*, as among *men* are *for confirmation and end of ſtrife*; ſeeing that very place expreſſes, that *all the former troubles*, which ariſe from *ſtrife*, which is it ſelf the moſt *troubleſome* thing to it, and the *grand ground* of all other *troubles* in the World (for *where envying and ſtrife is, there is the confuſion, and every evil work*, *Iam.* 3. 14. 15. 16.) ſhall *in thoſe days totally* be done away. See alſo *Rev.* 21. 1. *I ſaw a new Heaven, and a new Earth, for the firſt were paſt away, and there was no* SEA; that is, *trouble, ſtrife, toſſing, tempeſts, tumults, wars, hatred*, nor *contention*. Where trouble is forgotten, or ended, there *all ſtrife*, which is its cauſe, muſt be forgotten and ended, (elſe as *poſita cauſa ponitur effectus*, where the *cauſe* is, the *effect* will be; ſo where *ſtrife* is, *confuſion* and *trouble* will be) and where *all ſtrife* is forgotten and ended, there thoſe *Oaths*, which theſe men plead for, the very *end* of which is (as themſelves ſay) to *end all ſtrife*, muſt neceſſarily *ceaſe, end*, and be *forgotten* alſo.

Again, this *Propheſie* (ſay they *truly enough*) relates to the time of the *new Heavens and Earth wherein dwelleth Righteouſneſs*, when the *old*, wherein *unrighteouſneſs* dwelt, together with its *unrighteouſneſs*, is removed. Which *if ſo*, where is any *room* or *uſe* for *ſtrife*, and the *oaths* that are to *end them*, when *ſtrife*, which is *unrighteouſneſs*, and the *root* of *all unrighteouſneſs* is buried in the *bottomleſs pit* from whence it came?

J *Ives* argues p. 11. in his fifth Reaſon (as is aboveſaid) from the *being* of *ſtrife*, to the *neceſſity* of a *being* of *Oaths* to *end* them; but to run down and *rout* that *reaſon*, I ſhall *render* another *reaſon* out of J. *I*'s paper p. 9. *viz.* in the *latter days*, when the *new heavens and earth are created*, *wherein dwelleth righteouſneſs*, and *former troubles are forgotten*, there ſhall be no more of that *unrighteouſneſs*, thoſe *fleſhly works*, which *ſtrife* is none of the leaſt part of; therefore no more need of *Oaths then* to end all ſtrife.

Thus as of thoſe that argue againſt our *Tenet* of *perfecting holineſs* (as to *purging from ſin*) here, from the neceſſity of *ſins continuance* in them to *this end*, that they may be kept *humble*, I would fain know what need of *ſin to humble*, when *perfect holineſs*, which can't be without *true humility*, which is a *prime part* of it, is brought in? and what ſhall become of *Pride*, when *all ſin*, which it's *not the leaſt of*, is done away? So of them that ſay in the *new Jeruſalem* there's *need of Oaths* to *end* all *ſtrife*, I would as fain know (if they be able to tell me) what muſt become of all *ſtrife*, (which is ſuch a *troubleſom* piece of *unrighteouſneſs*, and the *root* of *all other trouble* & *unrighteouſneſs* alſo) in the day when all *ſuch ſin* and *tranſgreſſion* as *ſtrife* is, muſt be *finiſhed* and made *an end of*, and nothing but the *everlaſting righteouſneſs* brought in by *Chriſt*, who to ſuch as wait for it in *his Light*, is *bringing near* that his *righteouſneſs*, ſo that *it ſhall be revealed*, and *his ſalvation* from ſin ſo quickly, *that it ſhall not tarry*?

We ſee then how theſe *two men* make *one head* againſt *one man*, *viz. H. Den* and J. *Ives* againſt J. *Ives*, to puſh him down; and how both theſe men (well weigh'd) *interfeer* and hack their own ſhins, ſo as to come *limping* home in that lame cauſe they ventured out in: *What need we any further witneſs againſt them*? Ye your ſelves (O people) who have but half an eye, and do not ſhut it, may ſee their confuſion under their own hands; and how inſtead of *building their houſe* (as *Wiſdom* doth hers) they have with *folly pull'd it down with their hands*. So (as *H. D.* and J. *I.* hath done) let all *haſty Oppoſers of Chriſts plain Commands in print*, when (to ſave themſelves a *whipping*) they have *violated them*, contrarily to their own *comfort*, if not their *Conſcience*, make *Rods* for their own *tayles*, and *ſoundly flaſh* themſelves with them when they have done.

H.D. does no more (as to this point of *Propheſie*) in proof of *Swearing*; but J.I. doubles his Files, and fights on as follows, pag. 9.

J. I. That Text Pſal. 15. 4. *is by many underſtood to reſpect the time of the New-Teſtament; and if ſo, then one of the great Qualifications that is required of thoſe that ſhall dwell in Gods holy Hill, is that they ſhall ſwear to their own hurt, and change not.*

Rep

Rep. If ſo, that it relates to the *New-Teſtament*, as its underſtood by many to do? This is a *ſuppoſition* onely, therefore can be no ſound *proof* of the *point*, unleſs *J. I.* durſt lay it down in a *poſition*, that *ſo it is*. 2. Yet (to take it as *J. I.* would have it) let *J. I.* conſider again whether this be one of the *great qualifications* that's required of ſuch as ſhall dwell in *Gods holy Hill*, *viz.* that they *ſhall ſwear to their own hurt*? Does *God*, or did he ever require any man, on pain of *excluſion* from *his holy Hill*, to *ſwear to his own hurt*? *J. I.* ſayes ſo, and the *ſimple* may *believe every word* that he ſayes; but *the prudent will look well to his going*. And if *J. I.* ſayes I abuſe him in taking the *two Clauſes aſunder* that he *puts together*; affirming it a *bleſſed duty* when a man *hath ſworn* (though to his *own hurt*) not to *change*, I grant that, unleſs it be ſo that (*no Oath* being any *bond at all to any iniquity*) a man hath *ſworn* to do any ſin, as I do not ſay *J. I.* hath in *ſwearing* to be *peaceable* toward the *King* (though I judge he hath ſo far ſinn'd *in ſwearing* that, which, had he feared *God* more then *man*, he (ſpeaking the truth in his heart) ſhould but have *promis'd* or *aſſerted*, that he may *lawfully change*, ſo as to *repent* of his *raſh act* of *ſwearing*) otherwiſe, if a man have *raſhly ſworn* or *ſpoken* to his *loſs* or *damage* in *outward things*, it appears by this place he had better *keep* that *oath* or *word*, then *break it*: But what will *J. I.* get by all this, if *to ſwear* in this *Text* were not (as in truth it is) to be underſtood the ſame way as in that above ſpoken, *viz.* for *ſpeaking in righteouſneſs*, or *uttering* no more then the very *truth from the heart*, *viz. thus much* and *no more* then we *freely do*, and can *afford* to grant, namely, that this *Text commendeth* in no wiſe (much leſs *commandeth*) *ſwearing*, any more then *Matth.* 5. which *condemns* it *altogether* as *no Goſpel-duty*, but onely *condemneth Forſwearing* (a thing *in uſe* in theſe days, and in *faſhion well-nigh* as much as *ſwearing* is) which *ſin* of *Forſwearing* (though its fear'd it may *befall* many *ſeeming Saints*, that for *haſt* and *fear*, make *no conſcience* of *ſome ſwearing*) both *we*, and *Chriſt* alſo *approves* not in that place, where he downrightly (as an *evil*) *reproves* the other.

J. I. Iſa. 45, 23. God ſweareth, *That to him every knee ſhall bow, and every tongue ſhall* Swear; *and becauſe* ſacred ſwearing by

by GOD *is a* confeſſing of him, *the Apoſtle tranſlates every tongue ſhall* Confeſs, *Rom.*14.11. *plainly expounding the propheſie to relate to* New-Teſtament *times.*

Rep. This *J.I.* ſaies proves what I ſaid above *as fully* as I need, *or can deſire* to have it proved my ſelf: for it ſhews to him that's *willing to ſee it*, that the *Antitype* now in the *times* of the *Goſpel*, anſwering to the *Ceremony of Swearing*, which was the *Type* of it under the *Law*, is *Confeſſing*, and *not denying* when we witneſs *affirmatively*, though by but *Yea*; or *denying* onely, though by but *Nay*, when we witneſs *negatively* to *any truth*: If *confeſſing* and *denying to God*, from our hearts, or *before God now*, who knows our hearts, but by *yea* or *nay* be ſo under the Law, then *confeſſing* or *denying* from our hearts to *men* by but *yea* and *nay* (as *before God* who knows our hearts) is the *ſubſtance* of thoſe *ſhadowy Oaths* that were *under the Law*, and that *eternal Truth* into which that *Temporal Type* or *Ceremony* is now reſolved; ſo that whereas J. I. ſayes thus, *viz. And becauſe* ſacred Swearing by God *is a* confeſſing of him, the *Apoſtle tranſlates every tongue ſhall* Confeſs; I return thus, *viz. And becauſe* the confeſſing (in truth) of the *ſpirtual holy Seed*, (which is the *ſubſtance* of that *carnal holy Seed* which was the *Type*) is the *Suſthance* of that *ſacred, ceremonious Swearing* which was under the Law, The Apoſtle who wrote in the dayes of the *Goſpel*, expounds that thus, Every tongue ſhall *confeſs*; which the Prophet that wrote in the times of the *Law* when the *Type* of *Swearing* was in uſe, expreſſes thus, Every tongue ſhall *ſwear.*

H.D. in purſuit of the *proof* of his *propounded univerſality*, proceeds to the *conſent of all Nations.* I *will add one thing more* (quoth he) *which is the* conſent of all Nations whatſoever, *whether* Jews or Gentiles, Greeks or Barbarians, *between* Princes & Subjects, Enemies & Friends, *for the reconciling differences, ending controverſies, aſſuring of faith one towards the other: This appears among the* Greeks *by ſeveral unqueſtionable Authors, and Authentick Records amongſt the* Romans *by the Laws of the twelve Tables, among all other Nations under Heaven, by ſufficient evidence and demonſtration, which is able to put it out of all doubt. Now how great is this Authority, namely, the* conſent of all Nations?

It

It is *doubtleſs a demonſtration of the* ſecond rate, *ſome there are that account it of the* firſt rate, viz. *That the* conſent of Nations *is taken for Divine Evidence, and in many things we do ſo take it: What doth it ſpeak leſs, then that the taking of an* Oath *is one of the dictates written and engraven in the heart of man by* Natures finger, ſeeing that there is no Nation ſo barbarous, but doth acknowledge *the ſolemn and religious uſe of an Oath,* in *calling* their God *to witneſs, which conſidered, I have ſometimes wondred why the people diſtinguiſhed by the name of* Quakers *ſhould ſay, that the* Light within *them teacheth them to deny* an Oath, *when as that* Light *which is* Univerſal, *teacheth all the Nations of the earth the contrary.*

Rep. This ſeems to be given out by *H. D.* with more *pomp* and *triumph,* and *ſhew* and *ceremony,* then all its fellows, as ſome *grand ground* that adds weight to all thoſe *as light,* as *lightleſs* ones that went before it; but *mole ruit ſuâ* (ſaving its *greatneſs*) it hath not ſo much *goodneſs* in it, as will make good the ground againſt the *Qua,* who by *H. D.* (like as *Joſhua* and his fellows of old to the *Light-hating* Profeſſors) are as men wondered at, nor ſo much force as will ſave it from *falling* by its own *falſhood* to the ground: and were it as true (as *H. D. onely* ſaies 'tis) that *Swearing* was us'd amongſt *all Nations under heaven, by ſufficient evidence and demonſtration which is able to put it out of all doubt,* yet that would not put it out of *all doubt,* nor be *ſufficent evidence* and *demonſtration* that Swearing is now to be uſed among *true Chriſtians*: But alas, as great as *H. D.* faies this *Authority* is, namely, *The conſent of all Nations; which* (quoth he) *is a demonſtration of the ſecond rate,* at leaſt, and *ſome account* it of the firſt rate; yet as 'twil not prove *Swearing lawful* among *Saints,* were it *true* that it hath been ſo uſed, ſo neither is it *true* that it hath been ſo *univerſally* uſed (as he ſuppoſes) by *univerſal conſent* among *all Nations.*

There's yet no *demonſtration* or *evidence ſcientifical* afforded by *H. D.* that there's the uſe of an *Oath* among *all Nations* whatſoever, *Jews or Gentiles, Greeks* or *Barbarians,* eſpecially that it hath been us'd as *univerſally* in *all times* and *places,* as by all *perſons,* which is *the univerſality* of *ſwearing,* at firſt propounded by *H. D.* to be proved, in proſecution of his proof

of

of the *universality* of the use of *Oaths* by *all persons* in *all times*; who after he had only *conjectured* that practice of swearing to be not *above* 300. *years younger then the Moon*, falls a confessing p. 3. (as is shewed above) that (for ought he knows by *Scripture*, which *speaks not plainly what the old world did in this case*) 'tis no elder then about 400. *years younger then the Flood*: Now how can that be said to be *universally* us'd in *all times* and *places*, by *all persons* and *Nations by consent*, of which 'tis not *plain by Scripture-evidence* that 'twas in use at all for 1600. years together in the *old world*, nor till 400. (which with the other amount to 2000 years in all) were spent and gone even *of the new*? Who is so *blind* as *not to see* how *H.D.* dashes himself against himself, by pinching his own propounded *universality* into a meer *particularity*, as he renewed his first propounded *high Antiquity*, into no less nor more then that meer *novelty* of 2000. years after the *Moon*.

But 2*ly*. admit it had been 2000. years *elder* then *H. D.* makes it appear to be, and so in all times, yea and *by Consent* of *all Nations* used also; yet was it used neither by the *consent* of *all*, nor without the *dissent* of *sundry persons* and *parties* in *sundry Nations*; and so *H. D.*'s *Authoritative Doctrine* still goes down the wind, and can't be own'd at that *high rate*, at which he *prizes* it.

Now that it neither is, nor hath been so *universally assented to* by the Nations, as *H. D. nakedly* affirms it hath, but *dissented from* by *sundry* in the Nations where it hath been used, and that not *single persons* of note onely, but *whole parties*, and by *those persons and parties* still that were grown to discern best between the *Ceremony* and the *Substance*, and to prefer the *truth*, *power*, *equity* and *end* of the *Law*, before those *thin*, *empty*, *thred-bare*, *trashy* and *chaffy forms* and *formalities*, which (like as *Pharaohs* seven *lean Kine*, and *blasted ears of corn*, that did eat up the *fat* and *well-liking*) devoured ever the *equity* it self, and destroied things (as to their first *good*, *honest*, *innocent* and *true* intents) is evident enough to be seen in sundry instances of *men eminent* in their generations, among whom was *Philo*, who saith, *It is best and most profitable, and to the rational nature most convenient* to abstain from Swearing, *and so to accustome ones self*

to

to veracity, that ones Word *may be taken for* an Oath.

Also we read of the *Essæans*, the honestest of the three Sects of the Jewes in Christ's time, of whom some judg most of the *believing Jewes* came in Christ's time, that by faith in him became *Christians*; because the Scripture mentions none but the other two, *viz.* the *Sadduces* and *Pharisees*, few of which heeded *Christ*, and most of which did ever vehemently oppose both him and his few followers; Of those *Essæans* I say we read in *Josephus*, That *Whatsoever they say is firmer then* an Oath, *and to* Swear *is among them accounted a thing superfluous.*

Also from the *Essæans* and those *Hebrews* whom the *Essæans* followed, the same seems to be received by *Pythagoras*, whose sentence was on this wise; *Let no man* swear by the Gods, *but every one take care of his credit, that he may be believed* without an Oath. And whereas *H. D.* speaks *of all Nations*, yet if he had heeded what *Curtius* writes and relates of the *Scythians* in their sayings to *Alexander*, he would have found them testifying to him thus of themselves, *viz. Think not that the* Scythians *confirm their friendship by* Oath; *they* Swear *by keeping their* Word.

And because *H.D.* speaks so much of the *Laws* of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, by which they in their *twelve Tables* so strictly ratifying and injoining that practice of *Swearing*, he might have considered, how (according to *Cicero*'s relation in one of his *Orations*) when one at *Athens*, who had lived among them in great repute for his *gravity* and *sanctity*, had *publikely* given his *testimony*, and approached the *Altars* to make *his Oath*, all the *Judges* with one accord reclaimed, and would not let him *swear* upon this account, *viz.* Because *they would not have it thought that Truth depended more upon the Religion of* an Oath, *then upon* the Word *of an honest man*: All which serves to refute *H. D.* his *peremptory position* concerning the *consent of all Nations under heaven*, to the solemne and religious use of *an Oath*; at least, if by all Nations he means, as he well may (denomination being ever more *ex meliori*, then *ex majori*) the *best*, most *solemne*, and *truly religious* persons in those Nations. Thus we see to the confusion of *H.D.* that

Heathens consent, it's needless just men swear,
Forbid it, and cry out (for shame) forbear.

However let it be ne'er so *universally* now assented to by *all Nations*, yet *all in the Nations* assent not to it, nor yet that *peculiar people*, and *holy Nation* that is *redeemed unto God by the blood of the Lamb from among the Nations, Tongues, Kindreds and People of the Earth*, even the *holy Seed*, that is the *substance* of that *holy Seed*, or *Jewish Nation*, which with their *Ceremonies* were but *Types* for a time of *them* and their more *spiritual* and *substantial services*.

And this *dissent* from that *practice of Swearing upon a Bible*; with *fingering, kissing, holding up the hand*, or other *vain, superfluous customs* of man's imposing, so much *consented to* (as *H.D.* saies) among *all Nations*, is not now so *newly* entered in this *Nation of England*, but that we can give Presidents of holy *Martyrs suffering for it*, as well as for other things before us, even in *Q. Maries* daies, and before; whose sufferings *H.D.* and *J. I.* do what in them is to make of *none effect*.

Take some Examples and Testimonies of some Martyrs concerning *Swearing*.

In the Reign of Richard the second,

William Swinderby said, The *Pope*, the *Prelacy*, neither any *Ordinary*, can compel any man to *swear* by any *Creature of God*, or by the *Bible Book*.

In the Reign of Henry *the fourth.*

William Thorp was accused, that the second Sunday after *Easter* he said openly in St. *Chaddes* Church in his Sermon, That Priests have no title to Tythes, and that it is not *lawful to swear in any wise*.

Again, *Will. Thorp* accounted it *not lawful to swear upon a Bible-Book*, it being made up of divers Creatures, and that he ought not to *swear* by *any Creature*. The *Arch-Bishop* menaced him with great punishments, and sharp, except he left that Opinion of *Swearing*. He replyed, It is the Opinion of our *Saviour* and St. *James*, and doth conclude, if *Chrysostome* counteth him worthy of great blame, that *bringeth forth a Book to swear upon*; it must needs follow, that he is more to blame that *sweareth upon that Book*.

Then

Then (as *William Thorp* relateth) the *Clerk* ſaid, Lay thine hand upon the *Book*, touching the *holy Goſpel of God*, and take thy Charge. Then ſaid *William*, I underſtand that the holy Goſpel of God may not be touched with mans hands:

Walter Bruce in his Anſwer concerning *Swearing*, ſaith, I believe and obey the Doctrine of Almighty God, and my *Maſter Jeſus Chriſt*, which teacheth, that *Chriſtian men* in affirmation of a Truth, ſhould paſs the *righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees* of the old Teſtament, or elſe he excludeth them from the Kingdom of Heaven; for he ſaith, *Unleſs your Righteouſneſs exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

And as concerning Oaths, he ſaith, *It hath been ſaid to them of old time, Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but ſhalt perform unto the Lord what thou voweſt; But I ſay, Thou ſhalt not ſwear at all; but let your communication be*, yea, yea, nay, nay; *for whatſoever ſhall be more then this, proceedeth of evil.* Therefore ſaith he, as the *perfection* of the *antient men* of the Old Teſtament was not to *forſwear* themſelves; ſo the *perfection of Chriſtian men* is, *not to ſwear at all*; becauſe they are commanded of Chriſt, whoſe commands in no caſe muſt be broken. Although that the City of *Rome* is contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

Likewiſe in Queen *Maryes* dayes, in the fourth Examination of one *Elizabeth Young*, before the *Biſhop* of *London*, Doctor *Martin*, and others. See *Fox* 2d. *Vol.* pag. 1874.

D. *Martin* ſaid, *She hath a certain ſpirit of the* Anabaptiſts; *for ſhe refuſeth to ſwear upon the four Evangeliſts before the Judge; for I my ſelf, and Mr.* Huſſy, *have had her before us four times; but we cannot bring her to* ſwear, *&c.*

Then ſaid the Biſhop, *Wilt thou not ſwear before a Judge? that is the right trade of the* Anabaptiſts. *

Eliz. I will not *ſwear* that this hand is mine. No, ſaid the Biſhop; and why?

Eliz. Chriſt ſaith, Whatſoever

* It ſeems the Baptiſts in theſe dayes, many of whom do ſwear for fear againſt their Conſcientes, to their terror afterward, as I could inſtance in ſome at Nor-

Heathens consent, it's needless just men swear,
Forbid it, and cry out (for shame) forbear.

However let it be ne'er so *universally* now assented to by *all Nations*, yet *all in the Nations* assent not to it, nor yet that *peculiar people*, and *holy Nation* that is *redeemed unto God by the blood of the Lamb from among the Nations, Tongues, Kindreds and People of the Earth*, even the *holy Seed*, that is the *substance* of that *holy Seed*, or *Jewish Nation*, which with their *Ceremonies* were but *Types* for a time of *them* and their more *spiritual* and *substantial services*.

And this *dissent* from that *practice of Swearing upon a Bible*; with *fingering, kissing, holding up the hand*, or other *vain, superfluous customs* of man's imposing, so much *consented to* (as *H.D.* saies) among *all Nations*, is not now so *newly* entered in this *Nation of England*, but that we can give Presidents of holy *Martyrs suffering for it*, as well as for other things before us, even in *Q. Maries* daies, and before; whose sufferings *H.D.* and *J. I.* do what in them is to make of *none effect*.

Take some Examples and Testimonies of some Martyrs concerning *Swearing*.

In the Reign of Richard the second,

William Swinderby said, The *Pope*, the *Prelacy*, neither any *Ordinary*, can compel any man to *swear* by any *Creature of God*, or by the *Bible Book*.

In the Reign of Henry *the fourth.*

William Thorp was accused, that the second Sunday after *Easter* he said openly in St. *Chaddes* Church in his Sermon, That Priests have no title to Tythes, and that it is not *lawful to swear in any wise*.

Again, *Will. Thorp* accounted it *not lawful to swear upon a Bible-Book*, it being made up of divers Creatures; and that he ought not to *swear* by *any Creature*. The *Arch-Bishop* menaced him with great punishments, and sharp, except he left that Opinion of *Swearing*. He replyed, It is the Opinion of our *Saviour* and St. *James*, and doth conclude, if *Chrysostome* counteth him worthy of great blame, that *bringeth forth a Book to swear upon*; it must needs follow, that he is more to blame that *sweareth upon that Book*.

Then

Then (as *William Thorp* relateth) the *Clerk* ſaid, Lay thee thine hand upon the *Book*, touching the *holy Goſpel of God*, and take thy Charge. Then ſaid *William*, I underſtand that the holy Goſpel of God may not be touched with mans hands:

Walter Bruce in his Anſwer concerning *Swearing*, ſaith, I believe and obey the Doctrine of Almighty God, and my *Maſter Jeſus Chriſt*, which teacheth, that *Chriſtian men* in affirmation of a Truth, ſhould paſs the *righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees* of the old Teſtament, or elſe he excludeth them from the Kingdom of Heaven; for he ſaith, *Unleſs your Righteouſneſs exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

And as concerning Oaths, he ſaith, *It hath been ſaid to them of old time, Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but ſhalt perform unto the Lord what thou voweſt; But I ſay, Thou ſhalt not ſwear at all; but let your communication be*, yea, yea, nay, nay; *for whatſoever ſhall be more then this, proceedeth of evil.* Therefore ſaith he, as the *perfection* of the *antient men* of the Old Teſtament was not to *forſwear* themſelves; ſo the *perfection of Chriſtian men* is, *not to ſwear at all*; becauſe they are commanded of Chriſt, whoſe commands in no caſe muſt be broken. Although that the City of *Rome* is contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

Likewiſe in Queen *Maryes* dayes, in the fourth Examination of one *Elizabeth Young*, before the *Biſhop* of *London*, Doctor *Martin*, and others. See *Fox* 2d. *Vol.* pag. 1874.

D. *Martin* ſaid, *She hath a certain ſpirit of the* Anabaptiſts; *for ſhe refuſeth to ſwear upon the four Evangeliſts before the Judge; for I my ſelf, and Mr.* Huſſy, *have had her before us four times; but we cannot bring her to* ſwear, *&c.*

Then ſaid the Biſhop, *Wilt thou not ſwear before a Judge? that is the right trade of the* Anabaptiſts. *

Eliz. I will not *ſwear* that this hand is mine. No, ſaid the Biſhop; and why?

Eliz. Chriſt ſaith, Whatſoever

* It ſeems the Baptiſts in theſe dayes, many of whom do ſwear for fear againſt their Conſciences, to their terror afterward, as I could inſtance in ſome at Nor-

thampton, *and elſewhere*) *and many of whom plead in print for ſwearing, are now degenerated from that integrity, which the* Baptiſts *of old* (*cal'd then, as now, by the name of* Anabaptiſts) *did keep to at the firſt in that point of* ſwearing: *And as for ſuch* (*for there are a few, and but a few of thoſe*) *that are counted to the* Quakers, (*whoſe fall I mention, that I may not ſeem partial, as one juſtifying them more then the* Baptiſts, *in their denyal of the truth*) *who have taken the* Oath, *they fall into the ſame condemnation with them; witneſs not only the Letter above printed, but alſo this Relation that came concerning two or three more lately from* Ilcheſter, *and is here underprinted in way of warning to ſuch as ſtand, that they may take heed leſt they fall.*

Ilcheſter 5th.d. of the 1. m.

ONe R. Moon *at* Perin *in* Cornwall, *formerly own'd a friend, took the* Oath *through ſlaviſh fear; but afterward had no peace till he went to a* Juſtice, *and denyed what he had done; and now he hath ſome peace in* Lanceſton *Priſon, in denying what he hath done in diſobedience to* Chriſts Command; *and the laſt week two on the ſame account were ſent to this Priſon. So that all people may ſee the eminent hand of the* Lord *in it; for we know none elſe in all theſe parts that* denie the truth, *and the* Lord *hath found them out, and executed* judgement *ſpeedily upon them.* T. S.

is more then *yea, yea*, or *nay, nay*, it cometh of evil.

Then ſaid *Cholmly, Twenty pound it is a man in womans clothes. Twenty pound it is a man.*

Eliz. I am a woman.

Biſhop, *Swear her upon a Booke, ſeeing it is but a Queſtion asked.*

Then *Doctor Cook* brought her a *Book*, commanding her to lay thereon her hand.

Eliz. No, I will *not ſwear*, for I know not what *an Oath* is; but I *ſay*, That I am a woman, and have Children.

Biſhop, *That know we not; wherefore* ſwear.

Cholmly, Thou ill-favoured Whore, *lay thy hand upon a Book, I will lay on mine.*

Eliz. So will not I mine.

D. Cook, Swear *before us whether thou be a* man *or a* woman.

Eliz. If ye will not believe me, then ſend for *women* into a ſecret place, and I will be tryd.

Then *Cholmley called her* ill-favoured Whore; and *the Biſhop began to queſtion her concerning the* Sacrament of the Altar.

This laſt paſſage of thoſe Popiſh Prieſts and Biſhops, I was the more free to relate here, becauſe it is ſo *reſembled to the life*, or rather to the *death*, by that *light*, *unſavory deportment* of ſome in theſe days, who, when they ſhould *reprove* or *puniſh*, at leaſt

discountenance rather then imitate that *lewd demeanour* of those *Massy Ministers* (which is indeed unbecoming *meaner men*, much more either *Ministers* or *Magistrates*, when they sit in *Judicature*)do put sober Maids,when they are brought before them about the*Oath* of *Allegiance*, to swear whether they are Maids or not.

Thus we see these Dying Martyrs, that lived and died in their measure of the *Light of Christ* to them *then* given(whose *Testimony* one would think *H.D.*at least should take for *divine evidence* before the *Consent of the Nations* that are *universally erred, and universally alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, and because of the blindness of their hearts*, and *are past feeling*, being in the Fall from the *Light of God*) did enter their *dissent* in this case of *Swearing*, and seal to their *dissent from it* with their blood.

What a miserable thing is it then that *H. D.* should now *dissent* from the *holy Martyrs* and *suffering Saints* of God both *now*, and *of old*, in their Testimony against *Popish Superstition*, and cleave to those *customs* (as the Truth of Christ) which (excepting by the *Saints*) are *universally consented* to by the *Nations*: As he saies, *What Nation* so barbarous, *but doth acknowledge the solemne and religious use of* an Oath, *in calling* Their God(*mark*, Their God) *to witness*;so may we not as wel say, What Nation *so barbarous*, but that it hath some *false God* to worship,som *false way of Worship*?What Nation *so barbarom*,but it commits *Idolatry*, and *approves* it as *good* ? What Nation *so barbarous*, that will not fall down before some *golden image*,or *superstitious worship* or other with approbation, if the *Kings* and *Powers* think fit to impose it ? What Nation *so barbarous*, but it will alter, or for fear fore-go the Worsh p of *their God*, and their Religion, if their Rulers require it ? But what's this to the few Saints ? Are they to fashion themselves therefore according to the Nations, as *H. D.* would have them ? When *Nebuchadnezar* made a Decree for it, *all the people and Nations* (it is said) and the *Languages* consented, with their *Princes*, *Governors*, *Captains*, *Judges*, *Counsellors*, *Treasurers*, *Sheriffs* and *Rulers*, and fell down and worshipped the *golden Image* which *Nebuchanezar* the King set up, excepting the *three children of God*,

God: Was truth, therefore on the Nations ſides? Was their *conſent* to be taken for *divine evidence*, or the *diſſent* rather of thoſe *Three*? And when *all* the *people* forbore to *pray* to *their God*, except *Daniel*, becauſe *Darius* forbad them, was his *diſſenting* and *praying*, or their *conſenting* to leave it off whether, to be taken for *divine evidence*? Judge O Saints, *Dan.*3.3,7. & 7.7, &c. Yet *what doth it ſpeak leſs then that the taking of* an Oath (quoth he) *is one of the dictates written and engraven in the heart of man by* natures finger, *ſeeing there's no Nation* ſo barbarous, *but doth acknowledge the ſolemne and religious uſe of* an Oath? Hath he forgotten that the *Nature* and *Image* which the Nations are now *univerſally degenerated* and gone out into, from *that of God*, after which they were at firſt *created*, is *that of the Divel*, by which all (till they be *renewed and regenerated* back unto the other) are *children of wrath*? Is he ignorant that the *vail is over all hearts*, and the *face of a covering* and cloud of darkneſs is *ſpread over all Nations*; till it be removed and deſtroied by the *Light* of him, who is *manifeſted a Light to the Nations*, and is *come a light into the world* into men in their own conſciences by a meaſure of his Grace, that he *might deſtroy* that *nature, image, work and kingdom of the Divel*, who is the Ruler of the darkneſs of this world? Is he ignorant that the *world lies in wickedneſs*, 1 Joh:5. excepting thoſe few who *know they are of God*? Is he ignorant that the *whole world hath wondred after the Beaſt, and worſhipped the Dragon that gave his power to the Beaſt, excepting thoſe few whoſe names are written in the Book of life*?

What a thing is this that *H.D.* ſhould bring the *conſent* and *cuſtoms* of the Nations which are *vain*, that lie under a *corrupt nature, none doing good* in that, *no not one*; that *are all gone out of the way, altogether become abominable*, as a Preſident for *Chriſt's people* to be conformed to, who are charged *not to be conformed unto this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of their minds*, Rom.12.2.

He might almoſt as well have alledg'd this to prove the *lawfulneſs of prophane, ordinary, frequent, common ſwearing*, and *exorbitant, extravagant Oaths*, which himſelf condemns, as in proof of *any ſwearing now*, ſith *all the Nations* are conſented (though

(though they make Laws against it) yet to live and dye together in that ungodly practice, which the *Light within them* (but that they heed it not in one, nor yet in t'other) teacheth them to deny as well as t'other.

What the corrupt natures finger writes in mans heart, is as corrupt as the Nature by which it's written. Yet (quoth *H.D.*) *Considering the use of an* Oath *is writ in man's heart by* Natures finger, *I have sometimes wondered why the People, that are distinguisht by the Name of* Quakers, *should say that the* Light within them *teacheth them to deny* an Oath, *when as we see that* Light, *which is* universal, *teacheth all* the Nations *of the Earth the contrary.* And p.8. *If the* Quaker *say the* Light within *forbiddeth him* to swear, *the* consent of Nations *confuteth him.*

Monstrum horrendum, cui lumen ademptum! What confusion is here! Will *H. D.* make *Natures finger*, and the measure or beams of the *true Light* that comes from the *living God*, and *enlightens* παντὰ ἄνθρωπον, every man that *comes into the world*, John 1.9. all one? Or will he not blush to argue, that what the *Light of God within* men *forbiddeth*, and teacheth to forbear, that the *consent of the Nations* (as they are fallen) and that corrupt Nature they are fallen into, approveth and commandeth men to practice, and therefore they may practice it; as if it were safer to follow the imaginatious dictates of the Devils nature, which man hath *contracted* since he is gone out from that of God in which he was *created*, then to follow God's own Counsel, which is the Light in the Conscience? Doth he not know, that what is according to the *consent of Nations* in the fall, is not according to the *Light*, and and so not according to God the Author of that *Light*, and so stands condemned by them both?

Doth the *Baptist* say the *consent of Nations* confutes the *Quaker* in the point of *Swearing*, which the Light within him biddeth him to do? Doth not the consent of Scripture herein confute the *swearing Baptist*, while it sayes, *Swear not at all*, and that the customs of the Nations are vain? Is not the *Law* that's in *Heathens hearts*, whereby they are *accused* or *excused*, the *Law of God*, whose *Law is Light*? And is not that *Law spiritual*, (though *universal*?) yet will *H. D.* here call it

natural,

natural, *Natures finger*? Which, if he ſpeaks of the *Nature* that the *world* (excepting the *ſaints*) is found in while in the *fall*, and in the *imagination* of mans heart, is a *Nature*, and a *Finger* that writes *onely evil*, *vanity* and *deceit*; for whatever is *good*, *holy*, *true* and *juſt*, is written in man by the *Law*, by the *Light* and *Spirit* of the *living God*, by the *finger of God* in the *fleſhly Tables of his heart*, of which *his writing* with *his finger* in *Tables of Stone* of old, was but the *Type*, 2 *Cor.*3. but *Swearing* & *Oaths* which are of no uſe where *ſtrife* hath no *place*, which hath *place* onely in the fall, are none of thoſe things that are written there thereby: But if by *Natures finger H.D.* intends *Nature* in its *primitive purity*, while man ſtood in *innocency*, (as *perhaps*, yea *probably* and very likely he does) and by the writing of *Natures Finger*, he means what was written in man, when he was made *upright* by God himſelf, who made him, and gave him *light* and underſtanding.

If he will needs have that to be *natures finger*, and that *Light* and *underſtanding* to be but *natural* (which being *God's Law* in his heart, was *purely ſpiritual*, and flowing from God *by gift*, and not *ex traduce*, nor *ex principiis naturæ*) what gets he by it in his cauſe? For till *Strife* came in, *Oaths* could not come in, which were to *end* it; and therefore *no ſtrife* being *before* the Fall, *after* which the *enmity* had its being in man, *before* the Fall the *Light* that was *natural* (let him call it *natures finger*, or what he will) could not write in man's heart the *ſolemn* and *religious* uſe of *Oaths*: nor doth when man (the *enmity* being ſlain in him) recovers purely out of the *ſtrife* and *hatred* back again into the *love* and *peace*.

Obj. But quoth *H.D.* p.7,8. *How can that be accounted evil which is approved* by all Nations? *Recollect your thoughts, and conſider whether you can give me one inſtance of any one evil which hath been allowed and approved among all Nations: if you cannot, then 'twill be a ſufficent demonſtration that the taking of an Oath is nothing ſimply evil.*

Rep. But if we can, then 'twil be a *ſufficient demonſtration*, that (for ought *H.D.* hath at all urged to the contrary) the taking of *an Oath* may be *ſomething* that is *ſimply evil*, and that we may think it *unlawful to ſwear*, though the *conſent of Nations* doth *confirm it as lawful*.

I shall therefore give *one instance* of *something* that is not *lawful* to be used among the *Saints* and *Church of God*, and *Christs Disciples*, which yet is *allowed*, and *approved*, and *judged*, and *called good* among the Nations.

Luk.22,25,26. The *Kings of the Nations* (saith Christ to his Disciples) *exercise Lordship over them*, *and they that exercise Authority upon them*, *are called* Benefactors, *i.e.* Well-doers: Here's a thing agreed to by consent of *all Nations*, that their *Kings*, alias, *Rulers*, should exercise Dominion over them.

Yet it *shall not be so among you*; *but he that is greatest among you*, *let him be as the younger*; *and he that is chief*, *as he that doth serve*: Yea, *Paul* said, the Apostles had not *dominion o're the Faith* of the meanest; and *Peter* forbids the *Ministry* to Lord it, or have Dominion over the *Clergy*, or Heritage of God (μὴ κατα κυριευόντες τῶν κλήρων) yet that's a thing commonly consented to among the Nations, that their very Priests, as well as Princes, shall Lord it over them and their Faith, which they universally (excepting the Saints still) do pin upon their *Priests* and *Chemarims* sleeves. Here's an instance of *one thing universally approved* of, and *allowed* by *consent among all Nations*, which yet is *an evil* that ought not to be found among *Christs Disciples*, nor *true Christians*.

I have done with *H.D.* as to his *disputative* doings in this point of *Swearing* from these two Common places, or *Topicks* that *are common* to him and *Papists*, *viz. Antiquity*, and *Universality*; neither of which can prove the things they plead for, so *Catholick*, as to either *time*, *place* or *person*; but that we can shew both *when*, *where*, and *by whom* they were *dissented from*, and both *impleaded* and *disproved*. So that how *lame* these *two legs* are, upon which *H. Dens false witness* walks, he must be well-nigh *as blind* as *they* are *lame*, who cannot *see*. We have seen also how *pedlingly* these two men have proved the *lawfulness* of that *practice of Swearing*, from the *consideration* of its being *propheſied* of, and also its being *practised* by *precept* in *former dayes* by *holy men*, viz. the *Prophets under the Law*, and the *Apostles under the Gospel*: *Under the Law* we grant *holy men* us'd it as they did the other *types*, *figures*, *shadows* and *ceremonies* that pertained to it; but its *being practised* then by

precept, proves not that there is any *precept* now for its *being practiſed: Under the Goſpel* it would prove it *practicable now*, had it been both *practiſed* and *enjoined* by either *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*; but here they can give us neither *Preſident* nor *Precept* for (though we bring them no leſs then *expreſs prohibition* of) *ſuch a practiſe*.

Obj. *Chriſt forbids not* ſwearing by God, *but* ſwearing *by any thing* beſides God, *as Heaven, Earth*, the *Head*, the *Temple*, the *Altar* (as *Jer. Ives* ſaith, p.14.) whoſe words are theſe, *They did not matter what they ſware by, ſo they performed the things they promiſed; therefore* Chriſt *forbids their* ſwearing any Oath, *either by* Heaven, *or* Earth, *or the* Temple, *or* Jeruſalem, *or by* their Head; *but would it not be* illogical *to conclude from hence, That therefore we muſt not* ſwear by the Lord *in things lawful? So that by this Text, and that in* James, *we are forbid to* ſwear *by any thing* below God; *it alſo forbids all* voluntary Oaths, *which they* ſwore *to perform to the Lord by any* Creature. And p.13. All ſwearing: *in our* common communication *is forbidden*, (quoth he) *as appears by theſe words*, but let your communication be yea, yea: *Our Saviour and the Apoſtle forbid all* common ſwearing *in our* ordinary converſations, *and not* ſolemn *and* ſacred ſwearing. Alſo, as *H.D.* ſaith, p.7. *It appears to be the aim of our Saviour, not to forbid* ſolemn Oaths *before the* Magiſtrate, &c. *and between man and man upon grave and mature deliberation; but onely to put a ſtop to* common and frequent, light and trivial ſwearing. And p.6. Chriſts words *in proper ſpeech ſhould be read*, Let *not your whole Converſation be interwoven with Oaths.* And p. 8. *Chriſt indeed forbids thoſe* exorbitant and extravagant Oaths (meaning whether *by the Name of God*, or *other matters* in ordinary converſation) *whereof the ſtreets and Houſes are full.*

Rep. Chriſt does indeed forbid all ſuch voluntary *Oaths* as were in uſe *under the Law*, and all ſwearing *by any thing* beſides, or below God; alſo all ſwearing in common communication, and ordinary converſation (as *J. I. confeſſeth*) but that he doth not forbid alſo *all ſwearing*, even that which *H.D.* calls *ſolemn Oaths* before the Magiſtrate, & which *J. I.* pleads for under the term of *ſolemn* and *ſacred ſwearing*, is more then *H.D.* & *J. I.* have yet made good, or ever will; whoſe

whose confession of that, which none can deny, *viz.* That *common* and *frequent swearing*, and also *all swearing*, even by God himself in *common communication*, and *ordinary conversation*, is forbidden, will serve us sufficiently to make it good against *H. D. J. I.* or any other, that he doth forbid *all that swearing* before *Courts* and *Magistrates*, which *H. D.* and *J. I.* having of late so publikely practised it, begins now with shame enough, as publikely to plead for; for if Christ forbids (as *J. I.* pleads he does) *all swearing by God* in our *common communication*, & *ordinary conversation*, wherein *yea* and *nay* should serve the turn, and all *swearing commonly, frequently, ordinarily*, (as *H. D.* to the same tune phrases it out) doth he not then forbid that *ordinary, common, frequent swearing* by God, which is now in *Courts*, and imposed by *Justices*, then which, nothing almost is more *ordinary, frequent* and *common*? If our *Communications* and *Conversations* must be without *swearing*, and not *interwoven with Oaths*, is not this *exclusive* of *swearing* before *Justices* and *Magistrates*, as well as other men, in *Courts* and *Consistories*, as well as other places, where men have their *Conversation* and *Communication* with each other, as *ordinarily, frequently*, and *commonly* as elsewhere? Which considered, I have often mused why these men are so inconsiderate, as to interpret *Christ's Prohibition* as *exclusive* of mens swearing in their *ordinary converse* and *discourses*, and not in their *entercourses* with *Magistrates*, and in *Courts*, where *Oaths* (whether *de jure* they ought so to be, or no) are yet *de facto*, as *ordinary, frequent*, and *common*, as in any places whatever; especially that some men plead so much for *Oaths* before *Magistrates onely*, and yet can bring no proof for *swearing* before them, nor of their *right* to impose Oaths, more then others, among the many false *Instances* they bring of *Pauls swearing frequently* in his Letters to the Churches, and *imposing Oaths* upon them.

2*dly*, As to *H. D.* Christ does indeed forbid all such *exorbitant* and *extravagant Oaths*, as *H. D.* means; let him by those phrases of *exorbitant* and *extravagant*, mean what he can or will.

I say, Christ forbids such *exorbitant* and *extravagant Swearing*, (as above-said) but whether *more swearing* then that one-

ly which *H.D.* accounts on, for which the Land mourns, be not by Christ forbidden as *exorbitant* and *extravagant* now, is worth *H. D.* and *J. I.*'s most deep inquiry; yea whether *swearing by God* now, be not as *exorbitant* and *extravagant*, *i.e.* beside Rule, forbidden, as well as by ought else, and that as well in *serious*, as in *trifling* matter: Which if it be, then *swearing at all*, or *all swearing* (though some is much more so, then some) will seem to be beside the Way and Will of God, as well as some; and that it is there, needs not much proof to him that is not minded to wink against *Matth.* 5. 33. *Jam.* 5. 12. And here I shall take occasion to fall in with *H.D.* & *J.I.* about those two Texts from whence (as to our Scripture-grounds) we conclude against them the now *unlawfulness* of *any swearing*; yea, the *cessation* of *such swearing* as not onely *was then in use*, but (by *permission* and *commission* from God, as a Type for a time) is yeilded by us to have been *lawful under the Law*; and to the end it may be the more clearly seen on which side the Truth lies, whether *ours*, who speak plainly according to the Text, and the true intent of it; or on *theirs*, who most *palpably* pervert it; I shall set down the words as they lye in both those places, of both *Christ* and the Apostle *James*; *Matth.* 5. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. *Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine Oaths. But I say unto you, Swear not at all, neither by Heaven, for is is Gods Throne, neither by the Earth, for it is his foot-stool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the City of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more then these, cometh of evil. Jam.* 5. 12. *But above all things my brethren, swear not, neither by Heaven, neither by the Earth, neither by any other Oath; but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.* In which two Texts say we (in the *affirmative*) *all manner of swearing* is forbidden; for the *truth* of which *construction* there are many reasons to be given, as

1. Because *All manner of swearing* is *expresly* instanced in those *Disjunctive clauses*, which are expresly *conclusive*, and consequently (because spoken by way of *Probibition*) *exclusive*, *exceptive*

ptive of *all swearing* that can be thought on. *Swear not, swear not at all*, say the Texts; that's enough *to any* save such as list to be *contentious*; yea that none might imagine (as *H. D.* and *J. I.* would make men do) that this *general Rule* here *admits of* any *exception*, but all know that the *prohibition* is so strict, as to allow of no *permission* in that point, to *swear* by any thing *but God*, he addsn, either by *Earth*, neither by *Jerusalem*, neither by the *Head*.

And lest any should think he forbids onely and no more then the *extravagant Oaths* of such as *swear by the creatures*; as *Earth*, *Jerusalem*, the *Head*, and such like, when as who ever *sware lawfully* under the Law, was to *swear* by none but *God himself*; he adds, not *by heaven*, for it is *Gods Throne*; Which is *exclusive* of *all swearing* now *by God himself*, by whom men *might swear* in old time: For 23.20. *He that shall swear by Heaven, sweareth by the Throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon.* And lastly, that there may be no *roor* at all left for any *reasoning for swearing* against this flat prohibition of it, he concludes and shuts up all in such *universal terms*, as *exclude* both *all Oaths*, and all *possible pretence of plea* at all also for *any swearing*; adding, neither by *any other Oath*, when these are?

What words so *few* as these (if one would devise a form of speech to speak in to such a purpose) can be more *expresly exclusive* both of *all kinds* or *sorts* of Swearing, and of *all sorts* of *particular Oaths* of *every kind*.

2. It's most evident that Christ prohibits *somewhat more* here then was forbidden under the Law, yea whatever *Oaths* were *lawful* under the Law; therefore it must be either *all swearing* at all, or else *none at all*; either *all such swearing* as was *lawfully* used and allowed as a *type* for a time in the Law, *Oaths* made *lawfully* and *acceptably to God*, or else *nothing more at all then what was forbidden in the Law*: for all *false swearing* and *forswearing*, or *breaking solemne Oaths* made (as unto God) was forbidden *in* and *by the Law*; see *Numb.* 30.2. (the place which Christ seems to allude to) therefore here *swearing it self*, or nothing. *Mat.* 5. *Ye have heard it said by them of old time*, not of *late* by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* onely putting their false Glosses on the Law (as *J. I.* intimates out of other authors, with whose

Heifer

Heifer he plows, p. 13. saying the words [But I say] *Imply not that there was any thing in his precepts which was not in the Law, but rather somewhat that he would reinforce from the Law, which by reason of their* false Gloſſes *upon it, had no force upon their lives) but of old by Moſes and the Law, Thou ſhalt not* forſwear thy ſelf, *but ſhalt* perform to the Lord thine Oaths; *But I ſay*, Swear not at all, no not by *any Oath at all*: Note the oppoſition in that *adverſative particle* [*But*] which is between the *old, lawful, legal ſwearing*, and *no ſwearing at all*; not between *no ſwearing*, and ſuch *prophane ſwearing* as was unlawful *under the* Law. The ſumme is thus; The Law ſaid, *Break no Oaths*; but I ſay, *Take none*: For if he intends no more in theſe phraſes, *Swear not at all*, not by *any Oath*, &c. Then thus; *Swear not vainly, prophanely, ordinarily, exorbitantly, extravagantly* in your *common communication, forſwear not your ſelves*; What forbids he more then the Law forbad? which Law he came not *to deſtroy*, but *to fulfil*, by taking away the *Ceremony of ſwearing*, & *eſtabliſhing* the *ſubſtance* in its ſtead, which is, *ſpeaking the truth*, as in the ſight of God, *from the heart*: yea what ſaies he more to his Diſciples elſe, then the *Scribes and Phariſees* from the Law to *theirs*? For they ſaid, Swear not *prophanely, exorbitantly*, but *by God onely*; Swear not *falſly, forſwear not: ſwear and perform to the* Lord *thy Oaths*; they were as touching *that righteouſneſs* which was in the Law *blameleſs*; therefore *Chriſt* ſaies more to his Diſciples, and that muſt be, as 'tis in *expreſs terms*, ſwear *no Oath at all*; otherwiſe how could *their righteouſneſs* exceed that of the *Scribes* and *Phariſes*, which *except it did*, they could in *no caſe enter the Kingdom*. The *perfection* and *righteouſneſs* of the *Law* therefore in this poine of *ſwearing* was *Not forſwearing*, the *perfection* and *righteouſneſs* of the *Goſpel* in the ſame is *Not ſwearing at all*: So the *Goſpel* exceeds the *Law* in every point; the Law ſays, *Kill not*; the Wiſdom of the *Goſpel, Be not angry*; the *Law*, *Commit not Adultery*; the Wiſdom it ſelf in the *Goſpel*, *Look not on a woman, Luſt not*; the *Law*, *Love thy Neighbour, hate thine Enemy*, (for the *Jew* that was of the *Law*, might ſpoile the *Gentiles* their Enemies, but muſt lend to each other) the Wiſdome, *Love Enemies*: Which thing, though it might be ſpoken in the time of the *Law*, yet 'twas the *Wiſdom* and the *Spirit* ſpake

ſpake it, and not the *Law*, which allowed the *Iſraelite* to ſpoile the *Ægyptian* and the *Amalakite*; he was to help his Enemies *Ox* or *Aſſe* under a burden, *i.e.* if he were belonging to a *Jew*, that *perſonally* hated him, and not an *Amalakite*, one of the curſed race: But this *Type* is a riddle, I ſee, too hard for *J. I.* to read and unfold, who ſaies, the Law required to *love the Enemy*. The *Law* ſaid, *An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth*: The *Goſpel*, *Reſiſt not evil*; but *put up, paſs by, bear*; In all points the Word of the *Wiſdom* went beyond the *Law*, alſo in this of *Swearing*; yet it did not, if *now* there be any *ſwearing at all*.

Moreover *J. Ives* his words would imply, as if the Law had no force on the lives of *Chriſts Diſciples* now, as if they were ſhort of its *righteouſneſs*, but they were not now; and 'tis his *Diſciples* to whom he here directs his ſpeeches, and not the *Phariſees*, and ſuch as were *guided* and *gull'd* by their *Gloſſes*. So 'tis *Oaths lawfully* taken of old time that *Chriſt* here forbids, which the *Jewes* when they had taken, did not keep, though they ſhould have kept them; as in the points of that *Circumciſion*, *Paſſeover*, *Sacrifice*, *&c.* which were injoined before; ſo in that of *Swearing by God* to end ſtrife, *Chriſt* puts an end to the *Ceremony* and the *Type*, fulfilling it, and reſolves it by the *ſacrifice* of himſelf into the very *ſubſtance* and *Truth* it ſelf, the *Circumciſion* not made with hands, *Himſelf* our everlaſting Paſſeover, the *everlaſting Word*, *Covenant*, or *Oath* of God: So that (ſaving that men make ſo much ado about the *ſhadow*) we indeed are in the very *ſubſtance* of *all Oaths*, in *Chriſt Jeſus* the *Truth* it ſelf, in whom all the promiſes of God are *Yea*, and in Him *Amen*. We are in *that Truth*, in which and from which *ſpeaking*, *promiſing*, and *witneſſing*, though but by *Yea* or *Nay*, we witneſs more *Evangelically*, more *acceptably to God*, more *credibly to men*, more *ſubſtantially*, more *unchangeably* (our *Word* ſtanding without *variation*, when once paſt from us; our *Yea* being *Yea*, and our *Nay*, *Nay*) then all the *unconſtant*, *ſhuffling*, *ſhadowy* and *ceremonious Swearers* upon *a Bible* with *touching* and *kiſſing*, or by the *ſacred Sacrament*, by the *bleſſed Euchariſt*, by the *holy Evangeliſt*, *&c.* that are in all the world.

Yea our *Yea* and *Nay* is as *firm*, as free from change and *ſit*

to

to be truſted, as all their *Oaths* upon a *Book*, with whom there is nothing but *yea* and *nay*, *ſo* and *no*, and ſubjection to *forſwear* and *lye*, (our *Adverſaries* themſelves being *Judges*) ſo that as there is not cauſe for it, ſith (as *J.I.* ſaith) *he that will ſwear wickedly*, or againſt his conſcience, will lye; and he that cannot violate his conſcience ſo as to ſwear againſt it, cannot violate it by lying neither; ſo there is not more belief begotten in each others hearts by their own Oaths, then is by the bare word of an *honeſt man*; yea they confeſs they believe we are *innocent* as from Plots, *faithful* to the *King*, *peaceable* with all men. But alas! *Heu quam facile eſt invenire Baculum ad cædendum canem*; we are made worſe then *Dogs* by the *miſrepreſentations* of *malicious men*, and then it's an eaſie matter to find a matteragainſt us, & a *ſtaff* to beat us: *Et Damnati linguæ vocem habet, vim non habet*; the tongue of a condemned man, let him ſpeak what he wil, hath a *voice*, but little *force* to free him from ſuch as have more *reſolution* of *mind*, then *reality* of *ground* to perſecute him; otherwiſe *Chriſt* who had more *innocency*, would have had more *indemnity* then any man, if innocency might *indemnifie* a man from the envy and mercileſs cruelty of the wicked, who watcheth the righteous, ſeeking to ſlay him, & gnaſheth upon him with his teeth; but though the *Lamb* hath the *clearer*, and the *better* Cauſe, yet the *Wolfe* hath the *longer*, and the *bigger teeth*; and therefore the *Lamb* muſt be worried and devoured by him, for no more then meerly drinking at the *Fountain*.

Many more circumſtances there are that clear the 2. Texts aforeſaid, to be intended as we take them, as an *univerſal Prohibition* of *all ſwearing*; but *verbum ſat ſapienti*, a wiſe mans *faith* needs *few words* to confirm it. I ſhall therefore onely take notice of what *H.D.* and *J.I.* our joint oppoſers herein, do make againſt it; and ſo ſhut my hands at once of theſe two *ſhufflers* and their *ſhuffles*, beginning *firſt* with *J.I.* who *laſt* appeared.

1. *This Text* (quoth *J.I.* p. 7.) *of* Matth. 5. 38. *cannot be underſtood to forbid* all ſuch ſwearing *as was under the Law*. His reaſons, which are five (four of which have been ſpoken to above already, and therefore need no more *refutation*) are as follows:

1. *Be-*

R. Becauſe ſome ſuch ſwearing was uſed by Chriſt himſelf.

ep. 1. That Chriſt did *not ſwear.* 2. That if he had *ſworn* to the *High-Prieſt* (as *J.I.* falſely ſayes he did) yet it being *before the Law ended* at his death, to which, till *then*, *Chriſt* was conformable, it had been no more preſident for us, then his eating the Paſſeover, and other things, is ſhew'd above.

Reaſ. 2. The *Ordinances of the Law*, or *Old-Teſtament*, *of which* Swearing *was* one, *ended not till Chriſt's death, the Teſtator*; *but* ſwear not at all *was ſpoken before* his death; *therefore all ſuch* Oaths *as were commanded under the Law, are not forbidden by that Text*, Matt. 5. 38.

Rep. Though ſpoken *before his death*, yet with reference to the *Goſpel-times after his death*; And (*ad hominem*) if all that was *uttered* or *inſtituted* by Chriſt, *before Chriſts death*, ended at his death, let *J.I.* leave *baptizing in water*, and *breaking Bread*, which both were *enjoined*, and *actually* uſed *before* Chriſt's death; but that he will not do to this day: And if he plead a *reiteration* of the Commands for *Water-baptiſm* and *breaking bread. Acts* 10. *ult.* 1 *Cor.* 11. let him own the *prohibition of ſwearing* to be reiterated, *Jam.* 5. 12. after Chriſt's death. Moreover if *J. I.* had had his wits well about him when he wrote this *Reaſon*, he might clearly have ſeen how it renders his *foregoing Reaſon reaſonleſs*, as to the end he renders it for; this weakens the force of his argument for *ſome ſwearing*, from the *example* of *Chriſts ſwearing*; for the time wherein *J.I.* (but falſely) ſayes *Chriſt ſware*, was *before* his death, for he had not yet ſuffered; and that firſt *Teſtament* which the *Ceremony* of *Swearing* belonged to, continued till the *Teſtators death*; And *after* his reſurrection J.I. himſelf (who *falſly* ſayes he ſware *before* it) will not ſay *he ſware*. God concerning him *ſware* once for all, even that Oath of which there's no repentance, which ſtands *for ever*, ſaying (as concerning the *everlaſting Righteouſneſs* and *Peace* that ends all ſtrife) *Thou art a Prieſt for ever after the order of* Melchiſedec; And (as concerning the day of his Reſurrection) *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, *Pſal.* 110. No more *Oaths* now to him that ſtands faſt in this *Oath* or *Covenant* of God, which is of *Truth* and *Righteouſneſs*, *Life* and *Peace*.

Reaſ. 3. The *Prophets propheſie ſome ſuch ſwearing ſhall be us'd in the times of the* New-Teſtament; *therefore neither* Matth. 5. nor Jam. 5. *forbid all* ſuch ſwearing *as was* lawful *under the old.*

Rep. That the Prophets in the places cited by *H.D* and *J. I.* intend not *ſuch ſwearing* as was *under the Law*, but the *ſubſtance* it ſelf, i.e. *ſpeaking the truth in righteouſneſs*, denominated by the name of the *ſhadow*, or *type* of Swearing, is ſhew'd ſo abundantly above, that here needs no more.

Reaſ. 4. The Apoſtle Paul *both practiſed and enjoined ſuch* ſwearing, *and exacted* Oaths.

Rep. How falſe all that is, is ſufficiently declared above againſt both *H.D.* and *J.I.* to which *ſatis-dictum* I refer the Reader for his *ſatisfaction.*

Reaſ. 5. *As much need of* Oaths *now to end it, as ever, becauſe as much* ſtrife.

Rep. One ſin ever begets another; the men of this world are in *ſtrife, hatred, hard-heartedneſs*, and *unbelief* one towards another; in *fears, jealouſies, ſuſpitions* of *treachery* and *deceit* among themſelves, every one meaſuring others by himſelf; and therefore they lack ſuch *ſinful ſecurity* from each other, as that of *Swearing* againſt Chriſt's Command. Thus the Creation in the fall from the *Light within*, which would lead it forth into *love, truth* and *peace*, wreſtles in the *chains* of its own *darkneſs*, groans heavily under the bondage of its own *corruption.* But where the *Light* and *Spirit* is walk't in, there the luſts of the *fleſh* are not fulfill'd, but the *hatred, ſtrife, envy &c.* denyed, and the *love* witneſſed, which *believes* and *hopes* the beſt of all things, and thinks no evil of others, becauſe it's *true, honeſt, innocent, pure* & *peaceable* within it ſelf; and there's no lack of *Laws* to make ſuch *ſwear* to be faithful to each other, every one living by that, by which he is before God and men made a Law to himſelf: But to this Reaſon more is ſpoken alſo in the Book before.

Having prov'd (qnoth J.I.) *that* all ſwearing *is forbidden, it neceſſarily follows, that thoſe general Terms* [Swear not at all] *do admit of an exception. Sometimes* Univerſal Prohibitions *are taken with* Reſtrictions, *as* Exod. 20. 10. compared with Matth. 12. 5. *and* Numb. 28. 9. Matth. 23. 9. 15. 42. 44. Luke 6. 30.

Rep. How well *J.I.* hath prov'd *all ſwearing* not forbidden, is

ſeen

seen above; and the *wise in Christ*, though never so *weak*, will judge, when they read the foregoing *disproof* of all his Reasons. As for *general terms*, and *universal Prohibitions* admitting of *exceptions* and *restrictions*, I know well enough they do so now and then; but when they do, those *exceptions* and *restrictions* are usually in one place or other of the same *Testament*, where they are made, either *expressed*, or at least most *manifestly* and *apparently implyed* by him that gave out those *general terms* or *prohibitions*; and so are all or most of those very *exceptions from*, and *restrictions of* those *generals*, which *J. I.* himself hath instanced in. As for example, the *exception* of such *works* as pertain'd to *sacrifice*, that the *Priests* prophan'd it by, from, *thou shalt do no manner of work* on the *7th.* or *Sabbath-day*, is abundantly elsewhere *expressed* in the Law, where the Priest's services on every *Sabbath* are appointed them, and the *exception* of dressing what every one was to eat, was *expressed*.

And the *exception* of *doing good*, and of works of *mercy* in saving the life of *man* or *beast*, which was to take place ever against the *Typical Sabbath*, and all its service (*I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*, saith God) was *expres't* (as *J. I.* also intimates against himself, citing *Luk.* 14.5.) though the *Scribes* and *Pharises*, more out of malice to *Christ* then out of *ignorance* of those *expressions*, would not see all those *expres't exceptions* that were made against that general *Rule* and *Prohibition*, viz. *In it thou shalt do no manner of work*; and therefore grumbled at *Christs* healing on the *Sabbath* (as *J. I.* truly notes from *Luke* 13. 14.) and forbad the people *then* to come unto him.

And when Christ sayes to his Disciples (*as so*) *Call no man Father on Earth*; it's a *Prohibition* that *universally* holds among them (*qua tales*) for the *Saints* have no *Earthly Father*, but one is their *Father* in Heaven, even God the *Father of Spirits*, who of his own will begat them into the *Image* of himself, in holiness; in which capacity no *Fathers* of *their Flesh* are by them to be called *Fathers*: The *Rule* is *general without exception*, to him that rightly reads it; not requiring so much *expres't exception* as yet is *expressed*, if other Texts be consulted, which speak of *God* only being the *one Father* of *all believers*.

As for his two Texts that talk of *giving to all that ask*, and not *turning from any that would borrow*, which *J. I.* is loath so *generally* to understand, as Christ would have him, for fear least he should *turn himself* (as he saies) *out of doors*, and be *reduced to a morsel of bread*, and therefore pleads a *necessity* of a *restriction* in that case: Seeing he lacks to be *restrained* here, or else (in his *common Reason*) he thinks he must needs perish; let him consult but his own confession of it, and hee'l find enough (at least to serve his own end and turn, so as to save himself from sinking into a *morsel of bread*) of *expreß exception* in other Scriptures: For to *Christ's saying*, From any one that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away; *Do not other Scriptures* (quoth *J. I.*) *inform us that these* general terms *must be* restrained?

The *general terms* also wherein *H.D.* asserts the *antiquity* and *universality* of that practice of *Swearing*, which (*saith he*) was used *by* and *in all persons*, *places* and *times*, admits also of *exception* and *restriction*; yet that *exception* and *restriction* from his *general assertion* is expresly made by *H. D.* himselfe, who *excepts all the old world*, and the persons that liv'd therein for the time of 1600 years together, of whom and which (after his avouching, in proof of the *lawfulneß* thereof, the *antient* and *universal* use of *Oaths*) to shew that his *general terms* do admit of an *exception*, and are to be taken with *restriction*, *expresses* that *exception*, p. 2. on this wise (as is shew'd above) *viz. What the old world did in this case* (i. e. of Swearing) *the Scriptures do not speak plainly, and therefore I will pass it by*: which is as much as to say, *Swearing* was ever *generally* and *universally* used by *all the world* and Nations of it; by *all persons*, *times*, and *places*, excepting onely all *such persons*, *times* and *places* by whom, and in which it was not used, or (*exceptis excipiendis*) *excepting* all such as are to be *excepted*, which is all the old world by *whole sale* (for ought appears by *Scripture* to the contrary, quoth *H. D.* himself) and except so many persons in the New, as used it not at all (say I) which, as appears above, were *Christ* & his *Apostles* and *Churches*, the Sect of the *Essæans*, many *holy Martyrs* in *Maries* daies and upward, and (as appears at this day in this Nation, as wel as others) the many thousands of

sincere

ſincere hearted *Saints* and *Chriſtians* of this Age, called *Quakers*, who conſent not with the world, and actions of it, in that or any other *vain* and *evil cuſtoms*, being choſen and redeemed by Chriſt's blood from among them.

So Chriſt uttered many *Truths* in *general terms*, which muſt *admit of exception*, but then thoſe *exceptions* alſo are *expreſſed*. Chriſt ſaid *Luk.* 13. to *all the ſinners* that ſtood about him in theſe *general terms*, ye ſhall *all periſh*, this was not without an *exception* of ſuch as ſhould *repent*; but then that *exception* was not without an *expreſſion*; *viz. Except ye repent*: he ſaid oft to all his hearers, *Ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, that was not without *exceptions*, nor thoſe *exceptions* without *expreſſions*, *viz. Except ye be converted*, and become as *little children*, and Matth. 5. *Except your righteouſneſs exceed that of the Scribes and Phariſes*, many of whom yet were blameleſs, as to that righteouſneſs of the Letter of the Law.

Yea in the Verſes immediately before this *univerſal prohibition*, *Swear not at all*, Matth. 5. 30, 31. Chriſt ſaies, *'Twas ſaid of old, if any will put away his Wife, let him give her a Bill of Divorce: but I ſay whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, cauſeth her to commit Adultery*: this general term admits of an *exception*, but then that *exception* is thus *expreſt*, *viz. Saving for the cauſe of Fornication*; i. e. *Except* ſhe play the Harlot.

But now as to this *general term* and *univerſal prohibition*, *Swear not at all*, it cannot be taken with *reſtriction*, or as *admitting* of *any exception*; becauſe there is not onely *no expreſſion* made any where (after it) of anyſuch *exception*, but a *fuller amplificaton* of it by ſuch particulars, as are more particularly *excluſive of all kinds of Oaths*, and of *all Oaths* of any kind, thus, *viz.* Nor by *Heaven*, nor *Earth*, &c. nor any *other Oath*: And alſo by the Apoſtle *James* 5. 12. a *reinforcement* and *reduplication* of the ſaid *univerſal prohibition*: Whereas if Chriſt had intended *any exception* here, he might as eaſily have expreſt it, and would as *aſſuredly*, as he did *immediately* above, in the caſe of *Divorce* by, *Except in the caſe of Fornication*; and ſo have ſaid, *Swear not at all, except it be ſolemne and ſacred Oaths*, in *Courts*, when yee are called to *ſwear before a Magiſtrate upon a Book*: Bnt as I ſaid, in ſtead of *expreſſing* any *exception*

ception, he adds that which more ſtrengthens and clears, beyond all *exception*, the *univerſality* of his *prohibition*.

Thus we ſee in how *mean* a *manner* J. I. hath *managed* this *matter* he hath undertaken, of informing thoſe who are *tender*, *conſcientious* and *diſ-ſatisfied* in that *great Caſe of Conſcience* concerning *Swearing*, and thoſe two difficult Texts (as he calls them, *truly enough* in reference to himſelf, on whom they ſit too hard, for him to wind himſelf from under the condemnation of) *Matth.* 5. *James* 5. Which inſtead of opening, he hath by his *ſilly ſhuffles*, and *blind blurres* about them (which yet have a *golden gloſs* in the eyes of ſuch as, rather then *impriſonment*, chuſe to purchaſe their *Liberty* by *Swearing*) what in him lies, rather ſhut many men out from ſeeing into the true *mind* and *meaning* of the *Spirit* in them: So running himſelf upon both thoſe two *Rocks*, he pretends to carry people from ſuffering *rack* upon, *viz.* *Ignorance* and *Scandal*, which he, in the *ſame ignorance* in which he wrote all the reſt, likens to *Scylla* and *Caribdis* (whcih are not *two Rocks*, but the one a *Rock*, the other a *Gulf*) 1 *Ignorance* in as *blindly defending* that ſin of *Swearing*, which in the *blindneſs* of his mind he had before fell into. 2. *Scandal in offending* and *ſtumbling* the tender Conſciences of many an honeſt man, by his both *taking* and *talking* for the ſame.

And howbeit he hopes he hath the *price he runs for*, and ſo (*in words*) wiſhes *that God may have the glory*; yet *in deed* and *truth* *God's Name* hath *diſhonor*, and his *Truth ſhame* by his *dawby doings*. And if he have the *price he runs for* (as he hath not, if it be no more then the proving of *Oaths now lawful*, for he fails in that, but yet hath (for a time at leaſt) if it be the ſaving his Eſtate, as ſome not ungroundly ſuſpect it is) yet what will that profit him, had he not onely *ſav'd his own*, but *gain'd the whole world* to boot by it, ſeeing thereby he hath *loſt himſelf* (unleſs he yet *repent* and *recant* his raſhneſs in ſo running) in the ſight of *God* and *good men*.

And now a word or two more with *H. D.* as to *his doings* in denying the true mind of *Chriſt*, which we defend from *Mat.* 5.33: *Jam.* 5.12.

From

From whence when we argue, though 'twere *lawful* in *former times* to *ſwear*, yet it's *unlawful* to us *now*, having received here a *countermand* from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *H.D.* anſwers as follows:

H.D. *Have patience I entreat you, while I take liberty to examine your grounds, and to weigh them in the Ballance of the Sanctuary.*

Rep. Whoever is out of the *Light of God* which is in himſelf, wherein God dwells (as *H.D.* yet is, or elſe he would *juſtifie* both it, and the children of it, more then he ſeems to do in his two laſt pages, where he *Quips* at the *Quaker* and his *Light within him*, as confuted in the caſe of *Swearing*, by the *conſent* and *common cuſtom* of the *Nations* in the fall, whoſe cuſtoms the Scripture ſayes are vain, *Jer.*15. as if what the *Nations ſay* and *do* in their ſtate of *alienation* from *the Light*, were more *conſonant to the Light*, then what they *ſay* or *do*, who are *come to it*, and *continue* in it.) He is out of the *Sanctuary*, & hath none but the *uneven* Ballance of his *own Brain* to weigh what's truth withall; and condemns the *Generation of the Juſt*, and is himſelf, by ſuch as abide in the *Sanctuary* with the Lord, weighed in the *Ballance* of it, and found *too light*: And ſo is *H.D.* in his *driblings* about the point in hand. Howbeit we ſhall *have ſo much patience* as to *weigh* his *Exceptions* againſt our *Tranſlations* of the *Texts* aforeſaid.

And firſt to our Saviours own Prohibition, Swear not at all; *That which I bring in anſwer to this* (quoth he) *is an exception againſt the* Tranſlation; *the Greek word* At all, *is* ὅλως, *which ſignifieth* wholly *or* altogether, *rather then* at all; *ſo that in the proper ſpeech it ſhould be read*, Swear not wholly, *or* altogether; *let not your* whole communication *be interwoven with* Oaths.

Rep. H.Den peradventure may ſeem very bold indeed to ſome (as he ſayes p. 3. about his rare *rendition* of that other place *Gen.*4.26.) in taking on him to *tranſlate* this againſt the *common courſe* and *conſent of Nations*, and their *Commentators*, ſo *ſelfiſhly* and *ſingularly*, as he do's, to his own turn alſo; & though he ſeems as *bold* to my ſelf as any, yet is he in what he do's, not very much more *bold* then *welcom* to me; for though I will not allow every one to read it ſo (for it's rather to be read *at all*, then *altogether*) yet I can afford, him without *prejudice* to the

the truth we plead, to *wreſt* and *ſcrue* it ſo far as he does bedſies it ſelf; ſith *ſwear not*, nor *is*, nor *can be* denied to be a *Prohibition* of *Swearing*: Let *H.D.* put his terms *wholly* or *altogether* to it; what then will it appear to be to any (but ſuch a one as *H.D.* who does as it were, *Jurare in ſuam ipſius ſententiam*) but an *injunction totally* to forbear it, an *univerſal Prohibition* of it, that is, a *Prohibition of Swearing, even totally*, alias *wholly* or *altogether*? What gets *H.D.* then by this? What difference is there here (if the caſe be *candidly* conſidered by one that is not devoted to caſt *Clouds* in *clear Caſes* over *Chriſtian Conſciences*) between *ſwear not*, and *forbear ſwearing*, (theſe two *Phraſes* being both *Prohibitions* of one and the ſame thing, *i.e.* of *ſwearing*, it is *undeniably forbidden* in them both; and though by the *unuſualneſs* of the *promiſcuous uſe* of thoſe phraſes *at all*, and *altogether*, in our *Engliſh* Tongue, it ſeems at firſt ſomewhat *harſh*, *courſe*, *odd*, *uncouth*, and well-nigh *non-ſenſical* to uſe them indifferently, or one inſtead of the other in all places; yet, in *reality*, being rightly heeded, there is no more difference (as to their *ſenſe* and *ſignification*, though not their *ſound*) between *at all*, or *in any wiſe*, and *wholly*, *totally* or *altogether*, then there is between ὅλως & καθόλου, yea between ὅλως & πάντως, *omnino* & *omnino*, the *ſelf-ſame Greek*, and the *ſelf-ſame Latine* words, vvhich are *rightly* enough Engliſhed by them all.

And though to *H.D.* whoſe fancy works ſo ſtrongly to fetch it about his way (that he might *maintain that ſwearing now*, vvithout vvhich men are not like to be *maintained*) ſays, *Swear not wholly*, or *altogether*, ſeems to vary ſo much from *ſwear not at all*, or *in any wiſe*; making the firſt *excluſive*, of *ſome ſwearing* onely, and the laſt onely *excluſive* of *all ſwearing*; yet (hovvever it does in *ſound*) in *ſenſe* verily it varyes no more then μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, & μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, *nè jurate omnino*, & *nè jurate omnino*; that one *Greek*, and that one *Latine* phraſe, vvhich is truly *Engliſht* by them both: And let any man that confeſſes *ſwear not* to be the ſame in Engliſh vvith *forbear to ſwear* (as vvho does not) put that term *at all*, vvhich is *in univerſum*, *totaliter*, *omnino*, after one or t'other, & he ſhall ſee it amounts to the ſame in *ſenſe* (though not in *ſound*) for *forbear to ſwear at all*, and *ſwear not at all*, are (as to their

ſignifica-

ſignification) are *one* and the *ſelf-ſame* prohibition, in which *ſwearing at all* is forbidden, and in which *ſwearing at all* is *wholly, totally, altogether*, or *univerſally* forbidden: So I ſay, What ſuch difference is there between *forbear to ſwear at all*, or *leave ſwearing wholly, totally, univerſally* or *altogether*, and *ſwear not at all*, if men be not minded to muddle their own and others minds with they know not what? Nevertheleſs though *H. D.* get nought by it if we ſhould give it him, yet we will not give it for granted to *every one*, that the Word ὅλως muſt be rendered *wholly*, or *altogether*, rather then *at all*; for it may be, and is *at all*, as well as ſo; and yet *at all* and *altogether* (being both the *Engliſh* to ὅλως or *omnino*) are much at one.

But *H.D.* that he may ſeem to do *ſomething* now he is once entred (though *hoc aliquid nihil eſt*, it is no more then nothing to his purpoſe) *fiddles* on as follows,

That I may ſhew you (quoth he) *what warrant I have for this interpretation, conſider three places of* Scripture *where the word* ὅλως *is uſed; the firſt* is 1 Cor. 5. 1. ὅλως ἀκούεται, &c. *Fornication* is reported commonly among you; ὅλως (quoth he) *is here tranſlated* commonly, ordinarily, frequently, and it can *have no other ſenſe; for if it ſhould be tranſlated here by the word* at all, *it would be* ſound *without* ſenſe: *If I may take the liberty then to tranſlate it ſo in* Matth. 5. 33. *then it will run thus*, Swear not commonly, ordinarily or frequently: *And you ſee I have good Authority* (quoth H.D.) *for what I have done.*

Rep. Here *H.D.* by a *pretended Authority* takes a *liberty* to himſelf to tranſlate *Matth.* 5. 33. ſuch a way as both *varies* from his *own above*, & *overthrows* him alſo in his cauſe *ten times* more then that did; he tranſlated ὅλως in *Matth.* 5. before, *wholly* or *altogether*; and to ſhew (as he ſayes) what warrant he hath ſo to interpret it, he brings another place wherein himſelf ſays it's tranſlated quite another way, viz. *Commonly, ordinarily, frequently*, and according to that he would have *Matth.* 5. run thus, *Swear not commonly, ordinarily, frequently*, which is another thing, as different from *altogether* or *wholly*, as it is in *ſenſe* and *ſignification* from *at all.*

What ſtrange *twinings* and *turnings* doth the *Serpent* here uſe to *ſave* his *head*, by which he rather *wounds* it himſelf, then

ſaves it, either *altogether* or *at all*: For ſwear not *wholly, altogegether, totally* or *univerſally*, is one thing; Swear not *commonly, ordinarily, frequently*, is another: Men may ſwear *commonly, frequently, ordinarily* (as 'tis *common, frequent* and *ordinary* for men now to ſwear before *Magiſtrates*) who do not ſwear *univerſally, totally, wholly* or *altogether*, or in *all manner of converſation*: Theres a difference between *ſæpe* and *ſemper, often*, and *alwayes*; men may ſwear *ordinarily*, or *often*, who do not ſwear *in all caſes*, nor *at all times*.

Let *H.D.* then have it this way by the *Authority pretended, viz.* of its being ſo rendred 1 *Cor.*5.1. (though I would have him to ſee it, how the *Authority* of all *Tranſlators* rendring a word *ſo* or *ſo*, is no *good Authority* at all with him, when he is minded on his own head to vary from it; Witneſs *Mat.* 5.33. which though all *Tranſlators* that ever I read, render it, *Swear not at all*; yet the *Authority* of them all is not *worth a ruſh* with *H.D.* yea who ſees not howhe *wreſts* it from them all, to have it otherwiſe in his piece of *wrangling* for *ſome ſwearing*?) But I ſay, let him have it this way, *Swear not commonly, ordinarily, frequently*; What follows? Even *this* to his own *confutation*, (*viz*) That at leaſt that *ſwearing* before *Magiſtrates* that is in our *Courts*, which *H.D.* ſayes p.7. *it is the aim of our Saviour not to forbid*, and which he and *J.I.* (without any colour of Scripture) ſo eagerly contend for, is forbidden as vvell as any other ſorts of *common, frequent, light* and *trivial ſwearing*; for *ſwearing* is a thing us'd there as *commonly*, as *ordinarily*, as *frequently* as any thing elſe, or as *it ſelf* is in any other places; yet for this ſenſe *H.D.* contends on from his ſecond place, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 6: 7. ὁλως ἥττημα ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι: *If this ſhould be read* (quoth he) *there is* at all *a fault in you, what ſenſe is in theſe words*: *But if I read them thus, There is* vvholly, altogether, commonly, frequently, ordinarily *a fault in you; the ſenſe will be good.*

Rep. Its to be noted, that the *Corinthians* in going to Law one with another for their *own*, thought they did very well, & that there was no fault *at all*, in ſo doing, in them: Now his buſineſs being to convince them to the contrary, there is as good ſenſe in anſwering their *falſe Opinion* by *præocupation* in theſe words, *there is at all a fault in you* (*i.e.* though you think there's

ther's none *at all*, yet there is) as in the other by which it's rendered, ther's *utterly* or *altogether* a fault in you.

H.D's third place is 1 *Cor.*15.20. εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, *if the dead rise not at all*; this he confesses is according to the *English trunslation* good sense; yet he *appeals to all* (among whom I am one) *whether it be not better and nearer to the scope of the place if we read it thus*, *If the dead rise not* wholly, fully, *or* compleatly.

Rep. I answer, Not better for this one reason (which I urge as an Argument *ad hominem* onely, *cogent* enough to *H.D.* sith 'tis his *own*, else there's *little* in it) *viz.* Because we have the *good Authority* of the *Translators* on our side, so rendring as it is, *viz. If the dead rise not at all*,

2. Not *better*, nor yet *nearer*, but much *further* off from the the scope of the place, if we read it thus, *If the dead rise not wholly, fully, compleatly*; then if thus, *If the dead rise not at all*, & that for this reason, *viz.* Because the *Apostles* business all along in that part of the *Chap.* where this clause is, and *downward* to 35. *ver.* where he first begins to speak of the *manner of the resurrection*, insists wholly upon the proof of the *matter* of it, *viz.* That *the dead do rise*, against them who deny they shall rise *at all*; and not *how they shall rise*, *viz.* Whether *wholly*, *fully* or *compleatly*, or not, till he comes past this verse to the 35. Witness ver.12.13. *How say some that there is* no *resurrection of the dead? Now if there be* no *resurrection*, (*i.e.* none at all) *then we are false witnesses in testifying that God raised Christ, whom he raised not up, if the dead rise not* (*i.e.* not at all.) Ver.15. *And if the dead rise not*, *v.*16. (*i.e.* not at all) *then they that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perisht*; (if they be not *made alive* again, and *rise not*; not, if they be not *fully, wholly alive*, for that would suppose as if he were pleading against a sort of men that deemed men at the resurrection must be raised by *the halves*, or left *half alive* and *half dead*, which were absurd) but (quoth he) *all shall be made alive*, *v.*22. And then *v.*29. *Si omnino mortui non resurgunt*, *If the dead rise not* at all, ὅλως, if they be not made alive *at all*, but perish *wholly* or *altogether*; *why then are we baptized?* and *v.*32. *why do I fight with Beasts*, or beastial spirited men? *What advantage* is this to me *if the dead rise not* (*i.e.* at

all) Besides, let *H.D.* tell me what sense is in this, *viz. If the dead rise not* commonly, ordinarily, *if they rise not* frequently, *but* seldom, *or* sometimes only, *then our Faith is vain*, &c. *viz.* as much as is in this: The Law says, *Forswear not your selves*; but I say, swear but *seldom*. But if we read thus, *If the dead rise not at all*; the word *at all* bears *good sense* there, as he yeilds himself; and say I, as good as, *swear not at all*,

And lastly, further to inculcate on him the sense of *at all*, as very proper to ὁλως in the *New-Testament*, where he saies he finds it but three times; I shall shew *H.D.* one place where the word τὸ καθόλυ (which no Schollar will deny to be *altogether the same with* ὁλως, *both which* (I confess) signifie as *universally* as may be, *per totum, in universum, &c.*) is rendred [*at all*] where, if it should be rendred his way by [*ordinarily, frequently, commonly*] the absurdity that would follow, would be intolerable, *viz. Acts* 4.18. where the *chief Priests* commanded the Apostles to preach no more *at all* in the Name of *Jesus*, τὸ καθόλυ, *ne omnino prædicarent*; where if it should be rendred as *H. D.* would have the Word ὁλως, which in sense is the self-same: thus; *viz.* That they should not preach *ordinarily, commonly, frequently*, it would intimate that the *Priests* charge to the *Apostles* not to preach *at all*, was not an *universal Prohibition* of their preaching (as it was) but rather a *toleration* given them to preach *sometimes*, as they say (in effect) Christs prohibition of them is, *Matth.* 5. concerning swearing: For to say, Preach not, Swear not *commonly, ordinarily, frequently*, gives as much *dispensation* to preach and swear *sometimes*, *now and then a Sermon*, *now and then an Oath* (which would be a plea for some moderate *vain Swearers*, that *rap* out an *Oath by God* but *seldom*, or *now and then*) as it gives *prohibition* to men to swear so *often*, so *frequently*, so *ordinarily*, so *commonly* as they do in *Courts*.

Yet hath *H.D.* one fetch more in justification of his singular *Translation* of *Matt.* 5.33. against the *Qua.* and *all men*, and in proof that it should not be *swear not at all*, but swear not *ordinarily, commonly*; the *Hebrew Text* (quoth he) *in which Tongue it's generally judg'd* Matthews Gospel *was written*, *reads it thus*, Be col derek, *which is Englished, in every way.*

Rep.

Rep. I have *ſeen* and can *ſhew* one *Hebrew Text* which reads it *Be col dabar*, which (if it may not be Engliſh't *in any wiſe* (as I know not why it may not) yet may be, *in any word*, or *in any thing*; though at the rate at which *H.D.* reads his *Be col derek*, *in every way*, I know he will read it *in every thing*: But had he well heeded the manner of the *Hebrews* ſpeaking, he would have found *Be col derek* to be as truly tranſlated *in any way*, as *in every way*, and ſo have ſeen we are at leaſt upon *even ground* with him as to that; for there's an *Hebraiſm* in the words, and *Col* is as well uſed in the Scripture to expreſs *any*, as *every*, and ſignifies not onely *all*, but alſo (as the Hebrews often ſpeak by it) *any at all*; and if *H.D.* look into the ſelf-ſame place which his *Brother Ives* urges in another caſe (and *truly* enough to a *falſe end*; but *falſly*, if it be not to be rendered there as I have ſaid) he will find *Col* ſo uſed, *viz. Exod.* 20. 10. where in one *verſe* it's rendered *All*; in the next, *any at all*; *ſix dayes thou ſhalt labour and do* כל-מלאכתך *all thy work*, *but the ſeventh day is the* Sabbath, &c. *in it thou ſhalt not do* כל-מלאכה *any work*, or as it is rendered, Thou ſhalt do *no manner of work*, &c.

So that I have as much right to read *Be col derek*, *Be col dabar*, *nullo modo*, *ne nullo pacto*, (as *Munſter* hath it) *Swear not at all*, not *in any wiſe*, not *in any way*, or *in any word or thing*, as *H.D.* hath to read it, *Swear not in every way*, *or every word or thing*. But beſides, conſidering the *reaſons* in this Book above alledg'd, and the *circumſtances* intimated from the *Context*, or *foregoing* and *following* paſſages, I appeal to all men that have not *ſworn* away their *common ſenſe* and *reaſon*, whether there be not *ten*, yea an *hundred* times more reaſon to render it as it hath been hitherto, till *H.D.* entered his *diſſent*, and found out this *crotchet* whereby to croſs the *current* of all *Tranſlators* about it, thus; *viz. Swear not at all*; then thus, *Swear not* wholly, commonly, ordinarily, frequently, as *H.D.* o're and o're *vainly* reiterates it ought to be.

Now ſome *few words* in anſwer to *H.D*'s and *J. T*'s exceptions againſt our *reading* and *ſenſe* of *Jam.* 5. 12. and then I come to a *Concluſion* with them, or rather to *conclude* againſt them both, as they two in their *ſeveral ſenſes* on that *one place* conclude one againſt the other.

To

To your ſecond ground (quoth *H.D.*) *out of* Jam. 5. Above all things ſwear not: *I do appeal to the judgment of any rational man whether skilful or unskilful in Languages, whether this have the ſound of a true interpretation*, Above all things *it is worſe to* ſwear *then* to commit Adultery, *then to* kill the King *who is our Political* Father, *to kill* Father *or* Mother? *I know you will not ſay it.*

Rep. Doſt thou know we will not ſay it? Why then doſt thou ſo vainly ask whether this be a *true Interpretation*, which thou knoweſt not that any body makes? What *vanity* is this to frame an *Interpretation* which thy ſelf confeſſeſt is *no bodies* but thine *own, viz. That its worſe* to ſwear *then to* commit Adultery, *to kill* the King, *to kill* Father or Mother, and *then to appeal to all men whether it be true or no*? *Riſum teneatis*? *This is as ridiculous* a piece of buſineſs, as if one, having *raſhly* undertaken to diſprove a *man* to be *truly a man*, ſhould ſet forth a *Bull* to publike view, and then appeal to all men *skilful* or *unskilful*, to judge whether that have the ſhew or ſhape of one that is *truly a man*, yea or nay? Who ſayes its worſe to *ſwear* then to *commit adultery*, to *kill the King*, to *kill Father or Mother*? We who are call'd *Quakers* do not ſay ſo; and I know none does; and (to the clearing of all from ſo ſaying to whom he writes) *I know* (quoth *H.D.* himſelf) *you will not ſay it.*

But (quoth *H. D.* as *objecting* on behalf of his *Opponents*) *how then doth the Text ſay*, Above all things ſwear not? *If you ask, how I will read it, I anſwer* (quoth he) *the Greek is* πρὸ πάντων, *which ſignifies*, Before all things, *not* Above all things: *my warrant for this is* (quoth he) *not onely the* Vulgar, Eraſmus, Beza *in the Latine Tranſlations, who do all agree to tranſlate it*, ante omnia, *but alſo the compariſon of other places where the ſame phraſe, is uſed, as* Rom. 16. 7. πρὸ ἐμοῦ, Col. 1. 17. καὶ ἐστι πρὸ πάντων *which is well tranſlated*, He is before all things: *many more of the like nature may be alledged* (quoth he) *but theſe ſhall ſuffice.*

Rep. 1. *Many more of the like nature* might have been alledged (I confeſs) which had they been *alledged* by *H. D.* would *too plainly* have diſcovered the *intemperedneſs* of that *morter* wherewith he *dawbs*, whereupon, theſe ſeeming beſt to ſerve his *untoward turn*, he was rather willing that thoſe only ſhould ſuffice.

2. Had

2. Had *H. D.* asserted onely, that πρὸ πάντων signifies *Ante omnia*, *Before all things*, I should not contradict him in that, though our concession of that reading adds so little to that *simple sense* whereinto he would *wrest* that phrase (*ante omnia*, *before all things*) by interpretation, that to shew how little either *we lose*, or *he gets* by our granting him his *Translation*, I have so rendered it in my *Title-page*, viz. *Before all things* my Brethren *swear not*: But sith *H. D.* asserts that πρὸ πάντων doth *not* signifie *Above all things*, herein (if he mean neither *formally* nor *vertually*) I shal (whether himself wil see it, yea, or nay) shew him *his error* in the sight of all men: For *ante omnia*, or *before all things*, (and so *H.D.* will see if those *Logicals* (called *modi prioris & posterioris*) *i.e.* the several manners of *first* and *last*, *before* and *after*, be not worn utterly out of his memory) signifies *before in worth*, as well as *time*, and is as *truly* and *properly* used in *one* of these senses, as in the *other*; and when that præposition πρὸ, which is *ante*, is (as it ought to be in *James* 5. 12.) taken for *before in worth*, as well as *time*, it is as rightly rendred by *above*, as by *before*; and as πρῶτον, which is *English First*, sounds out a *priority*, *antecedency*, or *preheminency* in *place* or *dignity*, as truly as in *time* or *season*; so πρὸ πάντων a *superiority* in *power*, *place* or *worth*, and not a *priority* in *time* and *season* only; and so is as *ordinarily* and *truly* English *above*, or *over all things*, as *before them*: In proof of which sith *H. D.* (whether for *fear* or *forgetfulness*) was loath to alledge any places that make against him; I shall alledge one (besides this of *Jam.* 5.) where the *same phrase* πρὸ πάντων, which he says does *not* signifie *above all things*, is *English truly* in the *self-same way*, *i.e.* *above*, and not *before*, which shews that if it were rendred *before all things*, (as I deny not but it may be) yet it there signifies *before in Excellency* onely, and not *in time*, 1 *Pet.* 4 8. πρὸ πάντων, *above all things* have fervent love among your selves; I could afford to grant *H.D.* if he will, to read it here *before all things* have love; but if he do, he must *grant me* that *ante omnia*, *before all*, sounds out no other then *super omnia*, *above all things*; for love is the *last* thing attain'd to *perfectly* (as *to Time*) and yet in *worth* is *above*, or *before all knowledge*, *propheſie*, *tongues*, and o-

ther

ther *ſpiritual gifts*, as being indeed the more *excellent way* then any beſide it: So *above*, or *before all things have love*, is as much as to ſay, *with all your gettings, chiefly ſee to get it*; ſo *above* or *before all things ſwear not*, is as much as to ſay, *Chiefly take heed to this thing*, that ye *ſwear not*: In which ſayings, I ſay *above* or *before*, becauſe theſe two *ſound* forth the ſame thing in *ſenſe*, and are *promiſcuouſly* and *indifferently* uſed by us, as it happens, the one being in ſuch caſes altogether the ſame *in ſignification*, as the other.

And howbeit *H.D.* makes ſuch ado about his *ante omnia*, as if he gaind ſome *great ground* againſt us by reading it *before all things*; yet as we can *without loſs* allow him to read it *before all*; ſo *J.I.* who writes after *H.D.* ſees ſo little in H.D.s *quibble* in that particular, that he leaves H. *D.* his own *fellow-falſifier* of the Truth, and therein falls in with us againſt him, and reads and renders it as we do, *Above all things* my brethren *ſwear not*: Onely ſo unhappily blind he is, as to ſay, that ſuch *paſſionate Oaths* are forbidden in *Ja.*5.12. as that of *David* was, when he *ſware* and *vowed* not to ſuffer *his eyes to ſleep*, nor his *eye-lids to ſlumber*, till he found out a *place for the Lord*, an *habitation for the God of Jacob*; in which caſe *David ſware* moſt *innocently* and *ſolemnly*, not *paſſionately* (as he ſpake in the caſe of *Nabal*, 1 *Sam.* 25.21.34.) if ever he *ſware* an *innocent Oath* in all his days, and accordingly performed what he *ſware* and *vowed*; for though *Solomon* built the Houſe, as *J.I.* intimates, yet *David* in his affliction going up to the Floor of *Araunah*, there *found out*, and *appointed the place for the Houſe* to be built in, and gave the *pattern* of it, and prepared the *Materials* for the building, 1 *Chron.*21.18.19.20. 22.1.2. &c. 2 *Chron.* 28.10.11. and the Lord took it well at his hand, that it *was in his heart* to build it, 2 *Chron.* 6.8.

But the ſcruple that ſeems to hang behind in H. D.s mind ſtill, and the *gnat* he ſeems to *ſtrein at*, while he *ſwallows Camels*, is this; Why ſhould the Apoſtle ſay, Above *all things ſwear not*? Is that a ſin *worſe then Adultery*, *Murther*, and all other ſins.

Rep. We do not ſay it is; but if it be not, are there not more wayes *out of the wood*, as well as *into it*, then one? If that be not the reaſon why he ſayes, *Above all things ſwear not*, be-

cauſe

cauſe *ſwearing* is a *ſin above all ſins*, can no other reaſon then barely that be rendered for it?

Let *J. Ives* reſolve *H. Den* in that difficulty, if it be too hard for him to reſolve himſelf in it: For *J. I.* (but that he reaches too ſhort in his rendering of it, while he mentions *paſſionate Oaths* onely, when he ſhould have mention'd *ſolemne Oaths* alſo) renders a *right reaſon* of it ſo far as it *reaches*, and it's this, the *uſualneſs* and *commonneſs* of *that ſin of ſwearing*; he ſaies, *Above all things* my Brethren *ſwear not*, for it was *very uſual with them* (quoth *J. I.*) *to make paſſionate Oaths*; and ſo ſay I, and not onely (in former times) *paſſionate, exorbitant*, and *prophane*, but other *ſerious Oaths* alſo, in which (they being *Jews*, who were not yet ſo fully inform'd of the *ending of the Law in Chriſt*, under which among them *ſome Oaths were lawful*) they were apt to think they did as wel in *ſwearing* ſo now, as they did before, So though *adultery* and *murder* may be as *bad* and *worſe* then *ſwearing*, yet the *Law* being ſo *expreſs* againſt them, which yet in its time allowed *ſome kind of ſwearing*, it was more hard to bring them off from *ſome ceremonions ſervices of the Law*, that were *once lawful*, then from ſuch ſins as were known and hated by them, and held *accurſed* by the very *Letter of the Law*; and ſo he ſaies, *Above all things* take heed of *Swearing*, that they might know *that now* to be *unlawful*, which in former times was accounted *as lawful* for them: So it's ordinary to ſay to men *Above all things* take heed of that to which they have been long accuſtomed, and with which, through heedleſneſs of the *unlawfulneſs* of the thing, they are apt moſt eaſily to be overtaken.

One thing more, which is not a little conſiderable to evince the now lawfulneſs of any *Swearing* is this, *viz.* That by the *Eternal Wiſdom* of *God* (in that Book of *Eccleſiaſtes*, or the *Preacher*, wherein not the *Legal*, but the *Evangelical duties* and *righteouſneſs*, and the *ſins* and *unrighteouſneſs* oppoſite thereto are written of, and the *ſpiritualities* and *moralities* of the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, and not the *ceremonialities* of the Law pointed out) whereas To fear *an Oath* is made the *Character* of the *wiſe, good, clean* and *righteous* man that ſacrificeth acceptably to God, To ſwear (at all) is made the *Character* of

the *wicked*, the *unclean*, the *sinner* that (*so*) sacrificeth not, *Eccles.*9.1,2. the bare reading of which is enough to win a wise man from the sin of *Swearing*; for howbeit men shall once return and discern the happiness of him that serves God, from his *wo* who serves him not, yet here *one event is to the righteous and the wicked, to the good and to the clean and to the unclean, to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good, so is the sinner; as he that sweareth,* (mark, not he that sweareth exorbitantly onely, or forsweareth) *so he that feareth an Oath.*

Much more might be said to these mens *shuffles*; but a *little strength* may serve wherewith to overturn a *little strength*; and as it's *superfluity* to insist too long in *disproving* such *palpable pedling*, and *discovering* such *open subtilty*, as shews it self in their two pieces; so its but *meer vanity* to use a *Beetle* and *Wedges* to kil a flye.

I shall therefore conclude much what in *Hen. Dens* words, as I began: **All these things considered, the ground** for *solemn swearing* before *Magistrates* in *Courts* and *Consistories*, **appears not to be so sure as it was fancyed**; if (as the **Quaker** sayes it *forbiddeth him*, the *Baptist* sayes **the Light within him biddeth him to swear, the consent of** that *holy Nation* (the *Quakers* (so called) even those thousands among them that truly *tremble* at Gods Word, hated and cast out by their *Brethren*, the *English nominal Christians* of all *forms* and *professions*, chosen out of all the **Nations**, that consent to consult against them) **confuteth him**; if he or **others plead the Scriptures, you see how weak it is which they say; therefore let such as chuse to** *swear*, rather then to suffer in this case, **beware, lest they hear, Who hath required these things of you? Christ indeed forbids those exorbitant and extravagant Oaths whereof the streets are now full**; but he forbids also that *ceremonious*, *customary*, *superfluous*, *superstitious*, *vain*, *needless*, *extravagant*, *Anti-Evangelical*, *Antichristian*, *ordinary*, *frequent*, *forcibly imposed*, *common swearing*, of which all *Courts* are full; **A sad presage of some Judgement at hand**, that *Prisons*, *Streets*, *Princes* and *great mens Courts*, and *Places*, *Universities*, *Colledges*, and almost *all houses*, at least *all Alehouses* are full of *Oaths*, and mens discourses *interlin'd* and *interwoven* with worse then *So help me GOD*; even with *GOD CONFOUND*,

FOUND, GOD DAMN ME, and such like; and their Conversations converted from the Truth, so totally into *perjury* and *forswearing*: **It was hoped by some, that** (as *H. D.* speaks) **his Majesties Proclamation would have restrained**; and 'twere to be wished (say I) that the *Kings* said *Proclamation* might yet be used to *restrain such debauchery* and *deceit*; **but alas, it is nothing so; for** (as *H. D.* sayes) **such men reverence his Majesty no more then the Wolf in the fable did St. Authony**: So many *Magistrates* (not to say many to one, that is otherwise) reverence the *King* (say I) *so little*, as to take as *little care* to *execute* his *good Laws* and *Statutes* against such *exorbitant Oaths*, as the most *exorbitant swearers* do in their *common commerce* to *eschew them*; yea, as *little*, as the *Justices* themselves take *much care* (even *much more* then they will have thank for at last from either *God* or the *King*, or *good men*) *too hastily* and *strictly* to *execute* those *Laws* and *Statutes*, that are of old *extant* for those *forced Oaths*, or those *ordinary*, *frequent* and *common swearings*, which are imposed by them in their *Courts* and *Sessions*: **And indeed, how can it be expected that such as fear not Gods Majesty** (as few of the *subordinate Powers*, *Priests*, and *Priest-beguil'd* People do) **should regard** [as *H. D.* speaks] **the Kings Majesty, who is but as the drop of rain in comparison of him**; or regard the *Kings Laws and Proclamations* against *swearing*, whose *Prohibitions* of it are but *subordinate* to *Gods* own, which they regard not: Besides, they are so totally taken up now-adayes with *over-executing* those *entangling Laws*, and (as they *dream* and *deem* them) *most profitable Proclamations*, that (under pain of *forfeiture of Estates*) are *extant* for *Oaths*, and for *swearing*, that there's no leisure left to look after those most *truly profitable* and *wholesome Laws* and *Proclamations* of both *God* and the *King*, which cry out against both *Oaths* and *Forswearings*; though in this case if they acted all as *legally*, *honestly* and *earnestly*, in order to the encreasing of the *Poors poor-Box* in every *Parish*, as many do *illegally*, *dishonestly* and *eagerly*, towards the *decrease* of that *little* which the *righteous* hath, with which more good is every way done, then with the *vast revenues* of many *wicked*, who (while poor men perish) expend many thousands on *vain shews* and *kick-shaws*, there might accrue

ten times more *money* to the maintenance of the *poor*, were that *lowest penalty* of 12*d.* an *Oath*, according to the *Law*, exacted from every *prophane Swearer*, then will ever accrue to the enriching of the *Kings Coffers*, by punishing the *poor Quakers* for keeping *Christs Command*, so as not to *swear at all*, with the *loss* and *forfeiture* to the *King* (to whom the least part of it *commonly* comes also) of *no less* then *All* they have.

But what times do we behold! Nothing but extreams of evil are presented to our eyes and ears; Some do little but swear *ordinarily*, *frequently*, *commonly*, in *all* kind of *communication* and *conversation*, not onely in their *usual entercourses in Courts* with *Judges* and *Magistrates*, but in their *hourly Discourses* also, with other men, contrary to the *Laws* of both *Christ* and the *King*, and such are most mad in *prosecuting* the *Laws* of the *King for swearing*, on others who will not swear at all, *contrarily to the Laws of Christ the King of Kings*. Some fill their mouths with direful execrations upon every trifle, though there wants no *good Laws* against either *Drunkenness*, *Cursing*, *Swearing*; or other *prophaness* (as the late *Irish Proclamation* given out at the *Court* at *Dublin*, very *well* and *wisely* observes) but onely *this one*, That all those *good ones* that are made to curb these *exorbitances*, might (as *carefully* and *speedily* as the more *unwholsome ones* are) be put in *execution*. Others flye with *fierceness* upon such as for *Conscience* of an *Oath* onely will not yeeld to sweare when weighty Causes are before them, wherein they could declare enough, and with *cruel threatnings* vehemently urge them.

Who shall heal these distempers? Surely none can do it without the mighty Power of God break forth in all your Consciences (O thou much pityed *King* and thy *Council*, thy *Judges*, *Justices*, *chief Captains*, *Sheriffs*, and all other *Ministerial Officers* under Thee) to convince You and all *People* not onely of the *unlawfulness* of *all*, but of the utter *unnecessariness* of *any swearing*, sith as it's *evident*, that a *true Christians word* was wont to be taken for a *true Testimony* without an *Oath*, in that *Testament* which we are under, 2 *Cor.* 13. 1. So it's no less *evident*, that *his witness* of his own *peaceableness* towards the *King* and *all men*, who walks in truth, and (to preserve his *peace* with *Christ*) makes *Conscience* of an *Oath*, is more *worthy acceptation* (seeing such

such a one wil not lye, and can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth, 2 *Cor.*13.9.) then that of those *unpeaceaceable* and *deceitful* spirits who walk not in truth, who making *no Conscience* of either *Swearing* or *Forswearing*, will (to preserve themselves meerly from a *present suffering*) swear *future faithfulnes* to that, to which upon occasion they would prove *unfaithful*. Of the first of these, most *Magistrates* in their *Consciences* do (*without their Oath*) believe verily they are *Gods people*, *and Children that will not lye*, and that *God* also is *their Saviour*. As for the second, few that are concerned to take *security* from them (for all their *Swearing*) either will, do, or can trust them one jot further then they see them.

The † *Pythagoreans* forbad *Oaths*, so did the *Essæans* *, because they thought him *A noted Lyar* who could not be believed without an *Oath*.

† *Laert. in vita Pythagoræ.*
* *Philo Iudæus.*

The Lord open the eyes of *all men*; to whose Grace I commend this Work, and resolve to remain, as wel

Your Friend, (*H. Den* and *J. Ives*) against whom I write, as
Your Friend, (*O People of all sorts*) to whom I write,
S. Fisher.

POST-

POSTSTSCRIPT.

HEre followeth so much of a Letter of Jeremiah Ives, as is sufficient to shew him his deep Degeneration in Spiritual Matters; Dated about five dayes before he himself took the Oath, while he (in that Case) stood in his Integrity, and was imprison'd himself for not taking it; and directed to two of his Brethren: In which he declares what great Scandal they brought upon the Truth, and Offence to him, and his then fellow-Sufferers for it, by their Swerving for fear of men, from the fear of the Great God, so as to obey their Precepts for it, rather then Gods own plain Precept against Swearing.

Brother Pitman *and Brother* Shewell.

I Am at this time surprized with a holy passion; and though *Jonah* could not say concerning the *Gourd*, that he did wel to be angry; yet (if my experience in the Word of the Lord doth not deceive) I can truly say, I do wel to be angry with you; who I have had a godly jealousie of all along; *viz.* That you would be as easily perswaded to part with, ---as unwilling to suffer for, your Spiritual Liberties: Oh my Brethren! where is your first love? How unlike the Christians in former times are you? whose zeal was so hot for God, that their eyes prevented the morning, that thereby they might prevent the rage of the adversary, who (as it is now) *Commanded them no more to worship in the Name of the Lord.* ----I always did conclude, that those that would---quit the Cause of Righteousnes---would quit the Ways of Holiness, as yesterday sad experience hath taught, to the perpetual joy of your adversaries, and the sadning the hearts, and adding afflictions to the bonds of the Prisoners of the Lord: I do therefore conjure you, as you wil answer the great God another day, to consider, That now is the time for you to look to your Ministry, and to the Flock over which the Lord hath made you overseers, that you may be able through grace to say, *You are clear from the blood of all men*; and observe, that

that God is now come to prove you, to see whether you wil keep his commandements or not. Remember when that Apostates Case was debated, you had no zeal nor indignation against him, but you smothered all with this, If it were in a matter of Faith and Worship that he had fallen from, you would have been as one man against it: Wel, behold the Lord is come home to you; the matter now is purely for worshipping God; now God is proving to see if you wil obey him or no, and did not yesterdays work witness, that you were willing to prefer the fear of a man that must dye, before the fear of the great God; and the fear of them that can kill the body, before the fear of the Lord that can cast body and soul into Hell? I have no more to say but this, That your Cowardly Temporizing and complying with the precepts of Men, makes me jealous, that your fear towards the Lord is taught by the precepts of Men: I would not be too censorious, but my Grounds are great, and my *Bonds* are my *Crown*, but your Cowardly spirit is my *great Cross*: you little think what a scandal it is amongst us to hear it affirmed, that one of you should say, *You had rather a given fifty pound then have sworn*, and yet *swear* that you *swear willingly*. *Oh for the Lords sake do somewhat that may roul away this Reproach*; which that you may, is the praiers of your Brother, who could be contented to write himself, your Companion in Tribulation,

Jer. Ives.

Jan. 14. 1660.

Brother *Ward* my Fellow-prisoner desires to present his love to you, and so do some others.

Which Letter above printed, *is here* represented, *as a* Looking-Glass *for* J. Ives *to see himself in*: *not so much to* shame *him, as (if yet it may be) by the sight thereof (which being* his own, *may possibly have more force upon him then* another mans*) to recover him again to that* true Honor *of taking the* shame *of* his fall *to himself, and also of* suffering shame *with the* Saints *for the* Name of Christ, *which he once stood in, and since very easily* fell from; *and that he may* remem-

remember from whence he is fallen, and repent, and do his *first* works (for his *last* have not been found perfect before God) *and do somewhat that may roul away that reproach he hath rais'd against that* Righteous Cause *now suffer'd for by the* Saints, *lest the* Light *be at last totally taken from him; For as* Humanum est errare, *so* Humanius nihil est quam errantem revocare: *Or at least, (if* J.I. *be too far gone, and past* recovery) *then to* recover *the* Honor *of that* Truth *which, to the utmost that in him is, he hath dishonored by his* shameful shuffles; *that is to say,* 1. *By his* shuffling departure *from it in his* sinful passion *of* slavish fear of man, *so soon after his* holy passion (*as he calls it*) *of* Anger *against his* Brethrens *lesse* shameful (*because less* sinful) departure; *for* J.I.'s *suffering for it first, as* (*its likely*) *they two did not, declares his* Conscience *was convinced that he should not* swear. 2dly. *By his* shuffling *so much to* defend *and* vindicate *that same* Evil *of* Swearing, *when it became his own, which he had but a little before so egregiously condemned, while it was found not in himself, but in his* Brethrens; *and this in order meerly to the* palliating *of his meer* painted Piety *in that his* paultry departure: *For he that* builds again those *legal things* which once himself destroied, *therein* makes himself *no smal transgressor,* Gal: 2.18. 3dly. *By his* shuffling *so much* (*though with as little success among such whose* eyes *are in their* head) *being once departed from the* Truth *himself, to draw all others after him into the* Ditch. *Had he onely* (*when he saw no other way to escape* suffering) *contented himself rather to* swear *to his own* inward loss, *then to suffer* loss outwardly *for refusing it, his* recovery *might likely have been more* hopeful, *and his* Relapse *less* hurtful *in all likelyhood then now it is: But seeing he sets himself so zealously to* solicite *others to* sin *by* swearing *together with him, the* danger *of its* infecting others *who are set to see with his* eyes, *as well as the* desperateness *of his* Disease, *in respect of himself, calls for a more* desperate Cure, *and* searching Corrosive, *then need else be used: And if by all that is, in no less then true love to his soul, though never so sharply, tryed towards him; his wound appears to be uncurable, then*

Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.

THE END.